

from the surface within 2.5 miles each side of the King Salmon VORTAC 312° radial extending from the 5.2-mile radius of the King Salmon Airport to 12.5 miles northwest of the airport.

AAL AK CZ Kodiak, AK
Kodiak Airport, AK

(lat. 57°45'00"N, long. 152°29'38"W)

Woody Island NDB (lat. 57°46'28"N, long. 152°19'24"W)

Kodiak Localizer (lat. 57°45'08"N, long. 152°31'16"W)

That airspace extending upward from the surface to and including 2,600 feet MSL within a 3.1-mile radius of the Kodiak Airport, excluding that airspace west of a line 1.8 miles west of and parallel to the Kodiak

Airport Runway 18-36; and that airspace extending upward from the surface within 1.5 miles north and 2.5 miles south of the Woody Island NDB 253° bearing extending from the 3.1-mile radius of the Kodiak Airport to the Woody Island NDB and within 2.5 miles either side of the Woody Island NDB 073° bearing extending from the Woody Island NDB to 12.5 miles east of the Kodiak Airport.

* * * * *

AAL AK CZ Shemya, AK
Shemya AFB Airport, AK

(lat. 52°42'44"N, long. 174°06'49"E)

Shemya VORTAC (lat. 52°43'06"N, long. 174°02'55"E)

That airspace extending upward from the surface to and including 2,600 feet MSL

within a 4.4 1-mile radius of the Shemya AFB Airport, within 1.6 miles each side of the 104° radial from the Shemya VORTAC extending from the 4.4-mile radius to 4.5 miles east of the airport and within 2.3 miles north and 1.3 miles south of the Shemya VORTAC 275° radial extending from the 4.4-mile radius to 5.2 miles west of the airport.

* * * * *

Issued in Washington DC, on October 7, 1992.

Harold W. Becker,

Manager, Airspace-Rules and Aeronautical Information Division.

[FR Doc. 92-24903 Filed 10-13-92; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-13-M

Environmental Protection Agency

Wednesday
October 14, 1992

Part IV

Environmental Protection Agency

40 CFR Part 300

National Priorities List for Uncontrolled
Hazardous Waste Sites; Rule and
Proposed Rule

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 300

[FRL-4521-3]

National Priorities List for Uncontrolled Hazardous Waste Sites

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency.

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: The Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 ("CERCLA" or "the Act"), as amended, requires that the National Oil and Hazardous Substances Pollution Contingency Plan ("NCP") include a list of national priorities among the known releases or threatened releases of hazardous substances, pollutants, or contaminants throughout the United States. The National Priorities List ("NPL") constitutes this list.

This rule adds 26 new sites to the General Superfund Section and 7 to the Federal Facilities Section of the NPL, and deletes 4 sites. The identification of a site for the NPL is intended primarily to guide the Environmental Protection Agency ("EPA" or "the Agency") in determining which sites warrant further investigation to assess the nature and extent of public health and environmental risks associated with the site and to determine what CERCLA-financed remedial action(s), if any, may be appropriate. This action and a proposed rule published elsewhere in this *Federal Register* result in an NPL of 1,208 sites, 1,085 of them in the General Superfund Section and 123 of them in the Federal Facilities Section. An additional 28 sites are proposed, 25 in the General Superfund Section and 3 in the Federal Facilities Section. Final and proposed sites now total 1,236.

EFFECTIVE DATE: The effective date for this amendment to the NCP shall be November 13, 1992. CERCLA section 305 provides for a legislative veto of regulations promulgated under CERCLA. Although *INS v. Chadha*, 462 U.S. 919, 103 S. Ct. 2764 (1983), cast the validity of the legislative veto into question, EPA has transmitted a copy of this regulation to the Secretary of the Senate and the Clerk of the House of Representatives. If any action by Congress calls the effective date of this regulation into question, the Agency will publish a notice of clarification in the *Federal Register*.

ADDRESSES: For addresses for the Headquarters and Regional dockets, as well as further details on what these

dockets contain, see "Information Available to the Public" in Section I of the "SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION" portion of this preamble.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Martha Otto, Hazardous Site Evaluation Division, Office of Emergency and Remedial Response (OS-5204G), U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 401 M Street SW., Washington, DC 20460, or the Superfund Hotline, phone (800) 424-9346 or (703) 920-9810 in the Washington, DC, metropolitan area.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

- I. Introduction
- II. Purpose and Implementation of the NPL
- III. Contents of This Final Rule
- IV. Regulatory Impact Analysis
- V. Regulatory Flexibility Act Analysis

I. Introduction

Background

In 1980, Congress enacted the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act, 42 U.S.C. 9601-9675 ("CERCLA" or "the Act"), in response to the dangers of uncontrolled hazardous waste sites. CERCLA was amended on October 17, 1986, by the Superfund Amendments and Reauthorization Act ("SARA"), Public Law No. 99-499, stat. 1613 *et seq.* To implement CERCLA, EPA promulgated the revised National Oil and Hazardous Substances Pollution Contingency Plan ("NCP"), 40 CFR Part 300, on July 16, 1982 (47 FR 31180), pursuant to CERCLA section 105 and Executive Order 12316 (46 FR 42237, August 20, 1981). The NCP sets forth the guidelines and procedures needed to respond under CERCLA to releases and threatened releases of hazardous substances, pollutants, or contaminants. EPA has revised the NCP on several occasions, most recently on March 8, 1990 (55 FR 8666).

Section 105(a)(8)(A) of CERCLA requires that the NCP include "criteria for determining priorities among releases or threatened releases throughout the United States for the purpose of taking remedial action." As defined in CERCLA section 101(24), remedial actions tends to be long-term in nature and involves response actions that are consistent with a permanent remedy for a release.

Mechanisms for determining priorities for possible remedial actions financed by the Trust Fund established under CERCLA (commonly referred to as the "Superfund") are included in the NCP at 40 CFR 300.425(c) (55 FR 8845, March 8, 1990). Under 40 CFR 300.425(c)(1), a site may be included on the NPL if its scores sufficiently high on the Hazard Ranking System ("HRS"), which EPA

promulgated as Appendix A of 40 CFR Part 300. On December 14, 1990 (55 FR 51532), EPA promulgated revisions to the HRS partly in response to CERCLA section 105(c), added by SARA. The revised HRS evaluates four pathways: ground water, surface water, soil exposure, and air. The HRS serves as a screening device to evaluate the relative potential of uncontrolled hazardous substances to pose a threat to human health or the environment. Those sites that score 28.50 or greater on the HRS are eligible for the NPL.

Under a second mechanism for adding sites to the NPL, each State may designate a single site as its top priority, regardless of the HRS score. This mechanism, provided by the NCP at 40 CFR 300.425(c)(2), requires that, to the extent practicable, the NPL include within the 100 highest priorities, one facility designated by each State representing the greatest danger to public health, welfare, or the environment among known facilities in the State.

The third mechanism for listing, included in the NCP at 40 CFR 300.425(c)(3), allows certain sites to be listed whether or not they score above 28.50, if all of the following conditions are met:

- The Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry (ATSDR) of the U.S. Public Health Service has issued a health advisory that recommends dissociation of individuals from the release.
- EPA determines that the release poses a significant threat to public health.
- EPA anticipates that it will be more cost-effective to use its remedial authority (available only at NPL sites) than to use its removal authority to respond to the release.

Based on these criteria, and pursuant to section 105(a)(8)(B) of CERCLA, as amended by SARA, EPA has promulgated a list of national priorities among the known or threatened releases of hazardous substances, pollutants, or contaminants throughout the United States. That list, which is Appendix B of 40 CFR Part 300, is the National Priorities List ("NPL"). CERCLA section 105(a)(8)(B) defines the NPL as a list of "releases" and as a list of the highest priority "facilities." The discussion below may refer to the "releases or threatened releases" that are included on the NPL interchangeably as "releases," "facilities," or "sites." CERCLA section 105(a)(8)(B) also requires that the NPL be revised at least annually. A site may undergo CERCLA-financed remedial action only after it is

placed on the NPL, as provided in the NCP at 40 CFR 300.425(b)(1).

EPA promulgated an original NPL of 406 sites on September 8, 1983 (48 FR 40658). The NPL has been expanded since then, most recently on September 25, 1991 (56 FR 48438).

The NPL includes two sections, one of sites evaluated and cleaned up by EPA (the "General Superfund Section"), and one of sites being addressed by other Federal agencies (the "Federal Facilities Section"). Under Executive Order 12580 and CERCLA section 120, each Federal agency is responsible for carrying out most response actions at facilities under its own jurisdiction, custody, or control, although EPA is responsible for preparing an HRS score and determining whether the facility is placed on the NPL. EPA is not the lead agency at these sites, and its role at such sites is accordingly less extensive than at other sites. The Federal Facilities Section includes those facilities at which EPA is not the lead agency.

This final rule adds 26 sites to the General Superfund Section, for a total of 1,085 sites, and 7 sites to the Federal Facilities Section, for a total of 123 Federal facility sites. Therefore, there are now 1,208 sites on the NPL. An additional 28 sites have been proposed, 25 in the General Superfund Section and 3 in the Federal Facilities Section, and are awaiting final Agency action. Final and proposed sites now total 1,236.

The NPL no longer includes four sites for which the listing was vacated by a court order or voluntary removal:

Kent County Landfill (Houston), Houston, DE
Anne Arundel County Landfill, Glen Burnie, MD
Salford Quarry, Salford Township, PA
Murray-Ohio Manufacturing Co. (Horseshoe Bend Dump), Lawrenceburg, TN

Deletions/Cleanups

EPA is developing the NPL completions list to better show the successful completion of Superfund response action at present or former NPL sites and enhance public understanding of the status of cleanup progress at sites. Sites are organized into three categories: Construction completion, site completion, and NPL deletion. A site will move over time from completion of physical construction (construction completion) to achievement of remedial action objectives specified in the Record of Decision or ROD (site completion) to deletion (being formally removed from the NPL). Thus, the NPL completions list provides a "snapshot" of site cleanup status that will need to be periodically updated to reflect newly categorized sites, and sites moving from one

category to the next. More details on the completions list will be published shortly in the **Federal Register**.

EPA deletes sites from the NPL where no further response is appropriate, as explained in the NCP at 40 CFR 300.425(e) (55 FR 8845, March 8, 1990). To date, the Agency has deleted 44 sites from the General Superfund Section of the NPL, including the following 4 sites: Big River Sand Co., Wichita, KS; Pagano Salvage, Los Lunas, NM; BEC Trucking, Town of Vestal, NY; Westline site, Westline, PA. EPA, in consultation with the States of Kansas, New Mexico, New York, and the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, has determined that no further response is appropriate at these sites. EPA and the respective States have also concluded that remedial actions conducted at the sites to date remain protective of the public health, welfare, and the environment. All four States have concurred on the deletion of the sites from the NPL.

In making a determination to delete a release from the NPL, EPA considers in consultation with the State whether any of the following criteria has been met: (1) Responsible parties or other persons have implemented all appropriate response actions required; (2) all appropriate Fund-financed response under CERCLA has been implemented, and no further response action by responsible parties is appropriate; or (3) the remedial investigation has shown that the release poses no significant threat to public health or the environment and, therefore, taking of remedial measures is not appropriate. See section 300.425(e)(1) of the NCP. Prior to deletion, notice of the proposed deletion is published and an opportunity for comment has been provided for all these sites. Any sites deleted from the NPL remain eligible for Fund-financed remedial action in the event that conditions are later found to warrant such action. Section 300.425(e)(3) of the NCP provides that whenever there is a significant release from a site deleted from the NPL, the site shall be restored to the NPL without application of the HRS. Deletion does not affect responsible party liability or impede Agency efforts to recover costs associated with response efforts. Specific information about the sites follows.

Big River Sand Co., Wichita, Kansas

EPA published a Notice of Intent to Delete the site on July 9, 1992 (57 FR 30452). EPA also published a notification in the principal local newspaper on July 5, 1992. The closing date for comments was August 10, 1992. EPA received no comments on the merits of the deletion

of the site from the NPL, and one procedural comment. After reviewing these comments, EPA has concluded that deletion of the site at this time is appropriate. EPA provided a detailed response to the comment in a responsiveness summary which is contained in the Deletion Docket. Entries in the Deletion Docket may be reviewed at the U.S. EPA Region VII Waste Management Division Records Center, 726 Minnesota Avenue, Kansas City, Kansas, and at the Sedgwick County Public Library, Main Branch, 223 S. Main Street, Wichita, Kansas. For further information contact Diane Brewer, Environmental Protection Specialist, U.S. EPA, Region VII, 726 Minnesota Avenue, Kansas City, Kansas 66212, telephone (913) 551-7811.

Pagano Salvage, Los Lunas, New Mexico

EPA published a Notice of Intent to Delete the site on June 29, 1992 (57 FR 28817). EPA also published a notification in a local newspaper on June 28, 1992 regarding the proposed deletion. The closing date for comments was July 28, 1992. EPA received several comments regarding the deletion. After reviewing these comments, EPA has concluded that deletion of the site at this time is appropriate. EPA provided detailed responses to these comments in a responsiveness summary which is contained in the Deletion Docket. Entries in the Deletion Docket may be reviewed at the U.S. EPA Region VI office, 1445 Ross Avenue, 12th Floor suite 1200, Dallas, Texas and at the New Mexico Environmental Department in Santa Fe, New Mexico. For further information contact Carlos Sanchez, Remedial Project Manager, U.S. EPA, Region VI (6H-SA), 1445 Ross Avenue, Dallas, Texas 75202-2733, telephone (214) 655-8507.

BEC (Binghamton Equipment Co.) Trucking, Town of Vestal, New York.

EPA published a Notice of Intent to Delete the site on August 24, 1992 (57 FR 38289). EPA also published a notification in one local newspaper on August 19, 1992 regarding the proposed deletion. The closing date for comments was September 18, 1992. EPA received four comments.

One commenter expressed concern about a potential threat to the Town's water supply wells, and suggested that deleting the site from the NPL at this time is premature. Based upon the results of extensive investigations, EPA, in consultation with the State of New York, determined that the site does not pose a significant threat to human

health or the environment. Therefore, taking additional remedial measures is not appropriate.

The other three commenters indicated that the site should not be deleted since they believe that it should continue to be monitored. Deletion of the site from the NPL does not preclude continued monitoring at the site. In fact, the ROD provides for a continued monitoring program to verify that the remedy continues to be protective of human health and the environment.

After reviewing these comments, EPA has concluded that deletion of the site at this time is appropriate. EPA provided detailed responses to these comments in a responsiveness summary which is contained in the Deletion Docket. Entries in the Deletion Docket may be reviewed at the U.S. EPA Region II office in New York; at the Vestal Town Hall, 605 Vestal Parkway West, Vestal, New York; and the Vestal Public Library, 320 Vestal Parkway East, Vestal, New York. For further information contact Arnold Bernas, Remedial Project Manager, Superfund Branch, U.S. EPA Region II (2 ERD-NYCS1), 26 Federal Plaza, Room 29-30, New York, New York, telephone (212) 264-7612.

Westline Site, Westline, Pennsylvania

EPA published a Notice of Intent to Delete the site on December 17, 1991 (56 FR 65462). EPA also published a notification in three local newspapers on December 9, 1991 regarding the proposed deletion. The closing date for comments was January 16, 1992. EPA received one comment, which was in favor of deleting the site. After reviewing the comment, EPA has concluded that deletion of the site at this time is appropriate. Entries in the Deletion Docket may be reviewed at the U.S. EPA Region III office in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania; the McKean County Courthouse in Smethport, Pennsylvania; the Bradford Area Public Library in Bradford, Pennsylvania; and the Westline Firehall in Westline, Pennsylvania. For further information contact Roy Schrock, Remedial Project Manager, Superfund Branch, U.S. EPA, Region III (3HW22), 841 Chestnut St., Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19107, telephone (215) 597-0913.

In addition to the 44 sites that have been deleted from the NPL, 105 sites are in the construction or site completion categories, all but one from the General Superfund Section. Thus, as of September 30, 1992, a total of 149 NPL sites have been cleaned up.

Cleanups at sites on the NPL do not reflect the total picture of Superfund accomplishments. As of August 31, 1992,

EPA has conducted 2,349 removal actions, 557 of them at NPL sites. The removal actions taken will either stabilize or completely clean up the site. Information on removals is available from the Superfund hotline.

Information Available to the Public

The Headquarters and Regional public dockets for the NPL contain documents relating to the evaluation and scoring of sites in this final rule. The dockets are available for viewing, by appointment only, after the appearance of this notice. The hours of operation for the Headquarters docket are from 9:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m., Monday through Friday, excluding Federal holidays. Please contact individual Regional Dockets for hours.

Addresses for the Headquarters and Regional dockets follow.

Docket Coordinator, Headquarters, U.S. EPA CERCLA Docket Office, OS-245, Waterside Mall, 401 M Street, SW, Washington, DC 20460, 202/260-3046

Evo Cunha, Region 1, U.S. EPA Waste Management Records Center, HES-CAN 6, J.F. Kennedy Federal Building, Boston, MA 02203-2211, 617/573-5729

Ben Conetta, Region 2, 26 Federal Plaza, 7th Floor, Room 740, New York, NY 10278, 212/264-6696

Diane McCreary, Region 3, U.S. EPA Library, 3rd Floor, 841 Chestnut Building, 9th & Chestnut Streets, Philadelphia, PA 19107, 215/597-7904

Beverly Fulwood, Region 4, U.S. EPA Library, Room G-6, 345 Courtland Street, NE, Atlanta, GA 30365, 404/347-4216

Cathy Freeman, Region 5, U.S. EPA, Records Center, Waste Management Division 7-J, Metcalfe Federal Building, 77 West Jackson Blvd., Chicago, IL 60604, 312/886-6214

Bart Canellas, Region 6, U.S. EPA, 1445 Ross Avenue, Mail Code 6H-MA, Dallas, TX 75202-2733, 214/655-6740

Steven Wyman, Region 7, U.S. EPA Library, 726 Minnesota Avenue, Kansas City, KS 66101, 913/551-7241

Greg Oberley, Region 8, U.S. EPA, 999 18th Street, Suite 500, Denver, CO 80202-2466, 303/294-7598

Lisa Nelson, Region 9, U.S. EPA, 75 Hawthorne Street, San Francisco, CA 94105, 415/744-2347

David Bennett, Region 10, U.S. EPA, 11th Floor, 1200 6th Avenue, Mail Stop HW-114, Seattle, WA 98101, 206/553-2103

The Headquarters docket for this rule contains HRS score sheets for each final site; a Documentation Record for each site describing the information used to compute the score; pertinent information for any site affected by statutory requirements or EPA listing policies; a list of documents referenced in the Documentation Record; comments received; and the Agency's response to those comments. The Agency's responses are contained in the "Support Document for the Revised National

Priorities List Final Rule—October 1992." Each Regional docket for this rule contains all information in the Headquarters docket for sites in that Region, plus the actual reference documents containing the data principally relied upon by EPA in calculating or evaluating the HRS scores for sites in that Region. These reference documents are available only in the Regional dockets. The Headquarters docket and the Region 3 docket also contain documents relating to the decision to add the Austin Avenue Radiation Site in Delaware County, PA, to the NPL. Both dockets contain the public health advisory issued by ATSDR and EPA memoranda supporting the findings that the release poses a significant threat to public health and that it would be more cost-effective to use remedial rather than removal authorities at the site.

Interested parties may view documents, by appointment only, in the Headquarters or appropriate Regional Docket or copies may be requested from the Headquarters or appropriate Regional Docket. An information written request, rather than a formal request under the Freedom of Information Act, should be the ordinary procedure for obtaining copies of any of these documents.

II. Purpose and Implementation of the NPL

Purpose

The legislative history of CERCLA (Report of the Committee on Environment and Public Works, Senate Report No. 96-848, 96th Cong., 2d Sess. 60 (1980)) states the primary purpose of the NPL:

The priority lists serve primarily informational purposes, identifying for the States and the public those facilities and sites or other releases which appear to warrant remedial actions. Inclusion of a facility or site on the list does not in itself reflect a judgment of the activities of its owner or operator, it does not require those persons to undertake any action, nor does it assign liability to any person. Subsequent government action in the form of remedial actions or enforcement actions will be necessary in order to do so, and these actions will be attended by all appropriate procedural safeguards.

The purpose of the NPL, therefore, is primarily to service as an information and management tool. The identification of a site for the NPL is intended primarily to guide EPA in determining which sites warrant further investigation to assess the nature and extent of the public health and environmental risks associated with the site and to determine what CERCLA-financed

remedial action(s), if any, may be appropriate. The NPL also serves to notify the public of sites that EPA believes warrant further investigation. Finally, listing a site may, to the extent potentially responsible parties are identifiable at the time of listing, serve as notice to such parties that the Agency may initiate CERCLA-financed remedial action.

Implementation

After initial discovery of a site at which a release or threatened release may exist, EPA begins a series of increasingly complex evaluations. The first step, the Preliminary Assessment (PA), is a low-cost review of existing information to determine if the site poses a threat to the public health or the environment. If the site presents a serious imminent threat, EPA may take immediate removal action. If the PA shows that the site presents a threat but not an imminent threat, EPA generally will perform a more extensive study called the Site Inspection (SI). The SI involves collecting additional information to better understand the extent of the problem at the site, screen out sites that will not qualify for the NPL, and obtain data necessary to calculate an HRS score for sites that warrant placement on the NPL and further study. To date EPA has completed approximately 33,000 PAs and approximately 16,000 SIs.

The NCP at 40 CFR 300.425(b)(1) (55 FR 8845, March 8, 1990) limits expenditure of the Trust Fund for remedial actions to sites on the NPL. However, EPA may take enforcement actions under CERCLA or other applicable statutes against responsible parties regardless of whether the site is on the NPL; although, as a practical matter, the focus of EPA's CERCLA enforcement actions has been and will continue to be on NPL sites. Similarly, in the case of CERCLA removal actions, EPA has the authority to act at any site, whether listed or not, that meets the criteria of the NCP at 40 CFR 300.415(b)(2) (55 FR 8842, March 8, 1990). EPA's policy is to pursue cleanup of NPL sites using all the appropriate response and/or enforcement actions available to the Agency, including authorities other than CERCLA. The Agency will decide on a site-by-site basis whether to take enforcement or other action under CERCLA or other authorities prior to undertaking response action, to proceed directly with Trust Fund-financed response actions and seek to recover response costs after cleanup, or do both. To the extent feasible, once sites are on the NPL, EPA will determine high-priority candidates for CERCLA-

financed response action and/or enforcement action through both State and Federal initiatives. EPA will take into account which approach is more likely to accomplish cleanup of the site most expeditiously while using CERCLA's limited resources as efficiently as possible.

Although it is a factor that is considered, the ranking of sites by HRS scores does not by itself determine the sequence in which EPA funds remedial response actions, since the information collected to develop HRS scores is not sufficient to determine either the extent of contamination or the appropriate response for a particular site. (40 CFR 300.425(a)(2), 55 FR 8845). Additionally, resource constraints may preclude EPA from evaluating all HRS pathways; only those presenting significant environmental risk and sufficient to make a site eligible for the NPL may be evaluated. Moreover, the sites with the highest scores do not necessarily come to the Agency's attention first, so that addressing sites strictly on the basis of ranking would in some cases require stopping work at sites where it already was underway. In addition, certain sites, such as the Austin Avenue Radiation Site, are based on other criteria. More detailed studies of a site are undertaken in the Remedial Investigation/Feasibility Study ("RI/FS") that typically follows listing. The purpose of the RI/FS is to assess site conditions and evaluate alternatives to the extent necessary to select a remedy (40 CFR 300.430(a)(2)) (55 FR 8846, March 8, 1990). It takes into account the amount of contaminants released into the environment, the risk to affected populations and environment, the cost to remediate contamination at the site, and the response actions that have been taken by potentially responsible parties or others. Decisions on the type and extent of response action to be taken at these sites are made in accordance with 40 CFR 300.415 (55 FR 8842, March 8, 1990) and 40 CFR 300.430 (55 FR 8846, March 8, 1990). After conducting these additional studies, EPA may conclude that initiating a CERCLA remedial action using the Trust Fund at some sites on the NPL is not appropriate because of more pressing needs at other sites, or because a private party cleanup already is underway pursuant to an enforcement action. Given the limited resources available in the Trust Fund, the Agency must carefully balance the relative needs for response at the numerous sites it has studied. It is also possible that EPA will conclude after further analysis that the site does not warrant remedial action.

RI/FS at Proposed Sites

An RI/FS may be performed at sites proposed in the Federal Register for placement on the NPL (or even sites that have not been proposed for placement on the NPL) pursuant to the Agency's removal authority under CERCLA, as outlined in the NCP at 40 CFR 300.415. Although an RI/FS generally is conducted at a site after it has been placed on the NPL, in a number of circumstances the Agency elects to conduct an RI/FS at a site proposed for placement on the NPL in preparation for a possible Trust Fund-financed response action, such as when the Agency believes that a delay may create unnecessary risks to public health or the environment. In addition, the Agency may conduct an RI/FS to assist in determining whether to conduct a removal or enforcement action at a site.

Facility (Site) Boundaries

The purpose of the NPL is merely to identify releases or threatened releases of hazardous substances that are priorities for further evaluation. The Agency believes that it would be neither feasible nor consistent with this limited purpose for the NPL to attempt to describe releases in precise geographical terms. The term "facility" is broadly defined in CERCLA to include any area where a hazardous substance has "come to be located" (CERCLA section 101(9)), and the listing process is not intended to define or reflect boundaries of such facilities or releases. Site names are provided for general identification purposes only. Knowledge of the geographic extent of sites will be refined as more information is developed during the RI/FS and even during implementation of the remedy.

Because the NPL does not assign liability nor define the geographic extent of a release, a listing need not be amended if further research into the contamination at a site reveals new information as to its extent. This is further explained in preambles to past NPL rules, most recently February 11, 1991 (56 FR 5598).

II. Contents of This Final Rule

This final rule adds 26 sites to the General Superfund Section of the NPL (Table 1) and 7 sites to the Federal Facilities Section (Table 2). Proposal #11 (56 FR 35840, July 29, 1991) provided 15 of the sites; all are being added to the NPL based on HRS scores of 28.50 or greater. Proposal #12 (57 FR 4824, February 7, 1992) provided 18 sites; all but one are being added to the NPL based on HRS scores of 28.50 or greater. The Austin Avenue Radiation Site is

being added to the NPL on the basis of 40 CFR 300.425(c)(3) (55 FR 8845, March 8, 1990). A description of the site and EPA's basis for listing it were included when the site was proposed. As

discussed more fully below, Table 1 presents the sites in this rule arranged alphabetically by State and identifies their rank by group number. Group numbers are determined by arranging

the NPL by rank and dividing it into groups of 50 sites. For example, a site in Group 4 has a score that falls within the range of scores covered by the fourth group of 50 sites on the NPL.

NATIONAL PRIORITIES LIST FINAL RULE—GENERAL SUPERFUND SECTION

State	Site name	Location	Group
AR	Popple, Inc.	El Dorado	6
AR	South 8th Street Landfill (once listed as West Memphis Landfill)	West Memphis	4
CA	McCormick & Baxter Creosoting Co.	Stockton	1
CA	Ralph Gray Trucking Co. (once listed as Westminster Tract #2633)	Westminster	15
FL	Helena Chemical Co. (Tampa Plant)	Tampa	20
IL	Ottawa Radiation Areas	Ottawa	5
KS	57th and North Broadway Streets Site	Wichita Heights	5
KY	National Electric Coil Co./Cooper Industries	Dayhoit	5
LA	American Creosote Works, Inc. (Winnfield Plant)	Winnfield	4
MO	Big River Mine Tailings/St. Joe Minerals Corp.	Desloge	1
NE	Cleburn Street Well	Grand Island	5
NE	Sherwood Medical Co.	Norfolk	5
NH	New Hampshire Plating Co.	Merrimack	5
NY	Li Tungsten Corp.	Glen Cove	5
OR	Northwest Pipe & Casing Co.	Clackamas	4
PA	Austin Avenue Radiation Site	Delaware County	*
PA	Crater Resources, Inc./Keystone Coke Co./Alan Wood Steel Co.	Upper Merion Township	5
PA	Crossley Farm	Hereford Township	21

*Based on issuance of health advisory by the Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry (if scored, HRS score need not be >26.50).

State	Site name	Location	Group
PA	Foote Mineral Co.	East White-land Township.	5
PA	Metropolitan Mirror and Glass Co., Inc.	Frackville.	15
PA	Rodale Manufacturing Co., Inc.	Emmaus Borough.	5
RI	West Kingston Town Dump/URI Disposal Area.	South King-stown.	5
UT	Petrochem Recycling Corp / Ekotek, Inc.	Salt Lake City.	1
WA	Moses Lake Wellfield Contamination.	Moses Lake.	5
WA	Vancouver Water Station #4 Contamination.	Vancouver.	5
WI	Refuse Hideaway Landfill	Middle-ton.	15

Number of Sites Listed: 28.

NATIONAL PRIORITIES LIST FINAL RULE—FEDERAL FACILITIES SECTION

State	Site name	Location	Group
CA	Jet Propulsion Laboratory (NASA).	Pasade-na.	5
GU	Andersen Air Force Base.	Yigo	5
HI	Pearl Harbor Naval Complex.	Pearl Harbor.	1
TN	Memphis Defense Depot.	Memphis	2
VA	Naval Surface Warfare Center—Dahlgren.	Dahlgren	5

NATIONAL PRIORITIES LIST FINAL RULE—FEDERAL FACILITIES SECTION—Continued

State	Site name	Location	Group
VA	Naval Weapons Station—Yorktown.	Yorktown.	5
WA	Hamilton Island Landfill (USA/COE).	North Bonne-ville.	4

Number of Sites Listed: 7.

Public Comments

EPA reviewed all comments received on sites included in this rule. The formal comment period ended March 9, 1992 for the Austin Avenue Radiation site, April 7, 1992 for all other sites included from Proposal 12, and September 27, 1991 for all sites included from Proposal 11.

Based on the comments received on the proposed sites, as well as investigation by EPA and the States (generally in response to comment), EPA recalculated the HRS scores for individual sites where appropriate. EPA's response to site-specific public comments and explanations of any score changes made as a result of such comments are addressed in the "Support Document for the Revised National Priorities List Final Rule—October 1992." For 20 of the sites, including the Austin Avenue Radiation site, EPA received no comments.

NPL Format

Since promulgation of the original NPL (Appendix B of 40 CFR Part 300) on

September 8, 1983 (48 FR 40660), EPA has arranged the NPL by rank based on HRS scores. Sites in the General Superfund Section of the NPL were presented in groups of 50 (with their rank) to emphasize that minor differences in scores do not necessarily represent significantly different levels of risk. Sites on the Federal Facilities Section were presented by group number. In addition, each preamble for a proposed rule provided the group number for each proposed site.

On July 29, 1991 (56 FR 35843), EPA proposed to change the NPL format and list sites alphabetically by State and by site name within each State. EPA proposed this change because the growth of the NPL has made it increasingly difficult for users to find individual sites. Almost all public requests about the NPL ask if a particular site in a particular State is on the NPL, or ask for all sites in specific States, rather than ranks or scores for individual sites. In addition, the increase in the size of the NPL has meant that different groups of 50 may no longer represent significantly different scores.

EPA received seven comments supporting the change in format and no negative comments. The comments supported EPA's view that information by State is most helpful and questions of rank are infrequent.

As a result of the support received for EPA's proposed format change, and lack of negative comments, EPA will present Appendix B alphabetically by State

beginning with the NPL following this preamble.

EPA recognizes that some requests are for rankings. On July 29, 1991 (56 FR 35843), EPA also requested comment on whether each preamble should continue to include a ranking for sites in that particular rule, and if so, what form that ranking should take. One commenter suggested that sites be ranked by thirds based on score; another suggested the sites be listed alphabetically and be accompanied by HRS scores. No other comments addressed this issue. In response, because of these concerns that some form of ranking sites be maintained, the preamble of each rule will list proposed or final sites alphabetically by State and also identify the group number for each site. EPA believes this is a reasonable compromise between the need to make the NPL more useful, and the need to retain some indication of site rank.

EPA will continue to provide lists of all NPL sites ranked by HRS scores upon request to the Superfund Hotline, Phone (800) 424-9346 or (703) 920-9810 in the Washington, DC, metropolitan area. Requestors should note that EPA generally is able to respond more quickly to an informal request than to a formal request under the Freedom of Information Act.

Costs

One commenter questioned the cost estimates presented in the Regulatory Impact Analysis (RIA) section of the preamble to the July 29, 1991, proposed rule (56 FR 35845). The commenter stated that the values were substantially different from values in a similar table published on August 30, 1990 (55 FR 35511). The commenter also suggested that the Agency's cost estimate for operation and maintenance (O & M) of the cleanup remedy should be adjusted to account for inflation.

In response, the Agency inadvertently used an outdated table of cost estimates in the RIA section in the July 29, 1991, proposed rule. The following table shows the correct values:

Cost category	Average total cost per site ¹
RI/FS.....	1,300,000
Remedial Design.....	1,500,000
Remedial Action.....	25,000,000
Net present value of O&M ²	3,770,000

¹ 1988 U.S. Dollars.

² Includes State cost-share.

³ Assumes cost of O&M over 30 years, \$400,000 for the first year and 10% discount rate.

Source: Office of Program Management, Office of Emergency and Remedial Response, U.S. EPA, Washington DC

In response to the suggestion that the Agency account for inflation in cost estimates for O&M of cleanup remedies, the numbers do not account for inflation. The Agency uses current cost estimates because it cannot predict future inflation levels.

Statutory Requirements

CERCLA section 105(a)(8)(B) directs EPA to list priority sites "among" the known releases or threatened releases of hazardous substances, pollutants, or contaminants, and section 105(a)(8)(A) directs EPA to consider certain enumerated and "other appropriate" factors in doing so. Thus, as a matter of policy, EPA has the discretion not to use CERCLA to respond to certain types of releases. Where other authorities exist, placing sites on the NPL for possible remedial action under CERCLA may not be appropriate. Therefore, EPA has chosen not to place certain types of sites on the NPL even though CERCLA does not exclude such action. If, however, the Agency later determines that sites not listed as a matter of policy are not being properly responded to, the Agency may place them on the NPL.

The listing policies and statutory requirements of relevance to this final rule cover sites subject to the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) (42 U.S.C. 6901-6991i) and Federal facility sites. These policies and requirements are explained below and have been explained in greater detail in previous rulemakings.

Releases From Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) Sites

EPA's policy is that sites in the General Superfund Section subject to RCRA Subtitle C corrective action authorities will not, in general, be placed on the NPL. However, EPA will list certain categories of RCRA sites subject to Subtitle C corrective action authorities, as well as other sites subject to those authorities, if the Agency concludes that doing so best furthers the aims of the NPL/RCRA policy and the CERCLA program. EPA has explained this policy in detail in the past (51 FR 21054, June 10, 1986; 53 FR 23978, June 24, 1988; 54 FR 41000, October 4, 1989; 56 FR 5602, February 11, 1991).

Consistent with EPA's NPL/RCRA policy, EPA is adding three sites to the NPL, McCormick & Baxter Creosoting Co. in Stockton, CA, New Hampshire Plating Co. in Merrimack, NH, and Petrochem Recycling Corp./Ekotek, Inc. in Salt Lake City, UT, that are subject to RCRA Subtitle C corrective action authorities. Material has been placed in the public docket for the Petrochem Recycling Corp./Ekotek, Inc. site and the

McCormick & Baxter Creosoting Co. site confirming that the owners are in bankruptcy and unable to pay for cleanup. Regarding the New Hampshire Plating Co. site, even though the owner has not formally invoked the bankruptcy laws, available documentation indicates that the company assets cannot cover a current State lien on the property for response action, much less address any new expenses that would be incurred in financing corrective action. A more detailed discussion of this issue as well as supporting documentation is available in the public docket for this site.

Releases From Federal Facility Sites

On March 13, 1989 (54 FR 10520), the Agency announced a policy for placing Federal facility sites on the NPL that meet the eligibility criteria (e.g., an HRS score of 28.50 or greater), even if the Federal facility also is subject to the corrective action authorities of RCRA Subtitle C. In that way, those sites may be cleaned up under CERCLA, if appropriate.

This rule adds seven sites to the Federal Facilities Section of the NPL.

Name Revision

The names of two sites addressed in this final rule have been changed based upon additional information obtained since the sites were proposed. The site proposed as "Westminster Tract #2633 in Westminster, CA, has been changed to Ralph Gray Trucking Co. The site proposed as the West Memphis Landfill in West Memphis, AR, has been changed to the South 8th Street Landfill. Finally, the name of a site previously placed on the NPL, Holton Circle Ground Water Contamination Site, in Londonderry, NH, has been changed to Town Garage/Radio Beacon. These changes make it easier for the public to identify the sites.

IV. Regulatory Impact Analysis

The costs of cleanup actions that may be taken at sites are not directly attributable to placement on the NPL, as explained below. Therefore, the Agency has determined that this rulemaking is not a "major" regulation under Executive Order 12291. EPA has conducted a preliminary analysis of the economic implications of this amendment to the NCP. EPA believes that the kinds of economic effects associated with this revision to the NPL are generally similar to those identified in the regulatory impact analysis (RIA) prepared in 1982 for revisions to the NCP pursuant to section 105 of CERCLA (47 FR 31180, July 16, 1982) and the

economic analysis prepared when amendments to the NCP were proposed (50 FR 5882, February 12, 1985). This rule was submitted to the Office of Management and Budget for review as required by Executive Order 12291.

Costs

This final rulemaking is not a "major" regulation because it does not establish that EPA necessarily will undertake remedial action, nor does it require any action by a private party to determine any party's liability for site response costs. Costs that arise out of responses at sites in the General Superfund Section result from site-by-site decisions about what actions to take, not directly from the act of listing itself. Nonetheless, it is useful to consider the costs that may be associated with responding to all sites in this rule. Placing of a site on the NPL may be followed by a search for potentially responsible parties and a Remedial Investigation/Feasibility Study (RI/FS) to determine if remedial actions will be undertaken at a site. Design and construction of the selected remedial alternative follow completion of the RI/FS, and operation and maintenance (O&M) activities may continue after construction has been completed.

EPA initially bears costs associated with responsible party searches. Responsible parties may enter into consent orders or agreements to conduct or pay the costs of the RI/FS, remedial design and remedial action, and O&M, or EPA and the States may share costs up from and subsequently bring an action for cost recovery.

The State's share of site cleanup costs for Trust Fund-financed actions is governed by CERCLA section 104(c). For privately-owned sites, as well as publicly-owned but not publicly-operated sites, EPA will pay from the Trust Fund for 100% of the costs of the RI/FS and remedial planning, and 90% of the costs of the remedial action, leaving 10% to the State. For sites operated by a State or political subdivision, the State's share is at least 50% of all response costs at the site, including the cost associated with the RI/FS, remedial design, and construction and implementation of the remedial action selected. After construction of the remedy is complete, costs fall into two categories:

- For restoration of ground water and surface water, EPA will pay from the Trust Fund a share of the start-up costs according to the cost-allocation criteria in the previous paragraph for 10 years or until a sufficient level of protectiveness is achieved before the end of 10 years. 40 CFR 300.435(f)(3). After that, the State

assumes all O&M costs. 40 CFR 300.435(f)(1).

- For other cleanups, EPA will pay from the Trust Fund a share of the costs of a remedy according to the cost-allocation criteria in the previous paragraph until it is operational and functional, which generally occurs after one year. 40 CFR 300.435(f)(2), 300.510(c)(2). After that, the State assumes all O&M costs. 40 CFR 300.510(c)(1).

In previous NPL rulemakings, the Agency estimated the costs associated with these activities (RI/FS, remedial design, remedial action, and O&M) on an average-per-site and total cost basis. EPA will continue with this approach, using the most recent (1988) cost estimates available; these estimates are presented below. However, costs for individual sites vary widely, depending on the amount, type, and extent of contamination. Additionally, EPA is unable to predict what portions of the total costs responsible parties will bear, since the distribution of costs depends on the extent of voluntary and negotiated response and the success of any cost-recovery actions.

Cost category	Average total cost per site ¹
RI/FS.....	\$1,300,000
Remedial design.....	1,500,000
Remedial action.....	² 25,000,000
Net present value of O&M ³	² 3,770,000

¹ 1988 U.S. Dollars.

² Includes State cost-share.

³ Assumes cost of O&M over 30 years, \$400,000 for the first year and 10% discount rate.

Source: Office of Program Management, Office of Emergency and Remedial Response, U.S. EPA, Washington, DC.

Possible costs to States associated with today's final rule for Trust Fund-financed response action arise from the required State cost-share of: (1) for privately owned sites at which remedial action involving treatment to restore ground and surface water quality are undertaken, 10% of the cost of constructing the remedy, and 10% of the cost of operating the remedy for a period up to 10 years after the remedy becomes operational and functional; (2) for privately-owned sites at which other remedial actions are undertaken, 10% of the cost of all remedial action, and 10% of costs incurred within one year after remedial action is complete to ensure that the remedy is operational and functional; and (3) for sites publicly-operated by a State or political subdivision at which response actions are undertaken, at least 50% of the cost of all response actions. States must assume the cost for O&M after EPA's participation ends. Using the

assumptions developed in the 1982 RIA for the NCP, EPA has assumed that 90% of the non-Federal sites proposed for the NPL in this rule will be privately-owned and 10% will be State- or locally-operated. Therefore, using the budget projections presented above, the cost to States of undertaking Federal remedial planning and actions at all non-Federal sites in today's proposed rule, but excluding O&M costs, would be approximately \$99 million. State O&M costs cannot be accurately determined because EPA, as noted above, will share costs for up to 10 years for restoration of ground water and surface water, and it is not known how many sites will require this treatment and for how long. However, based on past experience, EPA believes a reasonable estimate is that it will share start-up costs for up to 10 years at 25% of sites. Using this estimate, State O&M costs would be approximately \$83 million. As with the EPA share of costs, portions of the State share will be borne by responsible parties.

Placing a hazardous waste site on the NPL does not itself cause firms responsible for the site to bear costs. Nonetheless, a listing may induce firms to clean up the sites voluntarily, or it may act as a potential trigger for subsequent enforcement or cost-recovery actions. Such actions may impose costs on firms, but the decisions to take such actions are discretionary and made on a case-by-case basis. Consequently, these effects cannot be precisely estimated. EPA does not believe that every site will be cleaned up by a responsible party. EPA cannot project at this time which firms or industry sectors will bear specific portions of the response costs, but the Agency considers: the volume and nature of the waste at the sites; the strength of the evidence linking the wastes at the site to the parties; the parties' ability to pay; and other factors when deciding whether and how to proceed against the parties.

Economy-wide effects of this amendment to the NCP are aggregations of effects on firms and State and local governments. Although effects could be felt by some individual firms and States, the total impact of this proposal on output, prices, and employment is expected to be negligible at the national level, as was the case in the 1982 RIA.

Benefits

The real benefits associated with today's final rule are increased health and environmental protection as a result of increased public awareness of potential hazards. In addition to the

potential for more Federally-financed remedial actions, expansion of the NPL could accelerate privately-financed, voluntary cleanup efforts. Listing sites as national priority targets also may give States increased support for funding responses at particular sites.

As a result of the additional CERCLA remedies, there will be lower human exposure to high-risk chemicals, and higher-quality surface water, ground water, soil, and air. These benefits are expected to be significant, although difficult to estimate before the RI/FS is completed at these sites.

V. Regulatory Flexibility Act Analysis

The Regulatory Flexibility Act of 1980 requires EPA to review the impacts of this action on small entities, or certify that the action will not have a significant impact on a substantial number of small entities. By small entities, the Act refers to small businesses, small government jurisdictions, and nonprofit organizations.

While this rule revises the NCP, it is not a typical regulatory change since it does not automatically impose costs. As stated above, adding sites to the NPL does not in itself require any action by any party, nor does it determine the liability of any party for the cost of

cleanup at the site. Further, no identifiable groups are affected as a whole. As a consequence, impacts on any group are hard to predict. A site's inclusion on the NPL could increase the likelihood of adverse impacts on responsible parties (in the form of cleanup costs), but at this time EPA cannot identify the potentially affected businesses or estimate the number of small businesses that might also be affected.

The Agency does expect that the listing of the sites in this NPL rule could significantly affect certain industries, or firms within industries, that have caused a proportionately high percentage of waste site problems. However, EPA does not expect the listing of these sites to have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small businesses.

In any case, economic impacts would occur only through enforcement and cost-recovery actions, which EPA takes at its discretion on a site-by-site basis. EPA considers many factors when determining enforcement actions, including not only the firm's contribution to the problem, but also its ability to pay.

The impacts (from cost recovery) on small governments and nonprofit

organizations would be determined on a similar case-by-case basis.

For the foregoing reasons, I hereby certify that this rule does not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities. Therefore, this regulation does not require a regulatory flexibility analysis.

List of Subjects in 40 CFR Part 300

Air pollution control, Chemicals, Hazardous materials, Intergovernmental relations, Natural resources, Oil pollution, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements, Superfund, Waste treatment and disposal, Water pollution control, Water supply.

Dated: October 5, 1992.

Don R. Clay,

Assistant Administrator, Office of Solid Waste and Emergency Response.

PART 300—[AMENDED]

1. The authority citation for part 300 is revised to read as follows:

Authority: 42 U.S.C. 9601-9657; 33 U.S.C. 1321(c)(2); E.O. 12777, 56 FR 54757, 3 CFR, 1991 Comp., p. 351; E.O. 12580, 52 FR 2923, 3 CFR, 1987 Comp., p. 193.

2. Appendix B to part 300 is revised to read as set forth below:

Appendix B—National Priorities List

TABLE 1.—GENERAL SUPERFUND SECTION, OCTOBER 1992

State and site name	City/county	Notes
Alaska:		
Alaska Battery Enterprises.....	Fairbanks N Star Borough.....	
Arctic Surplus.....	Fairbanks.....	
Alabama:		
Ciba-Geigy Corp. (McIntosh Plant).....	McIntosh.....	
Interstate Lead Co. (ILCO).....	Leeds.....	
Mowbray Engineering Co.....	Greenville.....	C
Olin Corp. (McIntosh Plant).....	McIntosh.....	
Perdido Ground Water Contamination.....	Perdido.....	
Redwing Carriers, Inc. (Saraland).....	Saraland.....	
Stauffer Chemical Co. (Cold Creek Plant).....	Bucks.....	
Stauffer Chemical Co. (LeMoyne Plant).....	Axis.....	
T.H. Agriculture & Nutrition Co. (Montgomery Plant).....	Montgomery.....	
Triana/Tennessee River (once listed as Triana (Redstone) Arsenal).....	Limestone/Morgan.....	C
Arkansas:		
Arkwood, Inc.....	Omaha.....	
Frit Industries.....	Walnut Ridge.....	
Gurley Pit.....	Edmonson.....	
Industrial Waste Control.....	Fort Smith.....	C
Jacksonville Municipal Landfill.....	Jacksonville.....	
Mid-South Wood Products.....	Mena.....	C
Midland Products.....	Ola/Birta.....	
Monroe Auto Equipment Co. (Paragould Pit).....	Paragould.....	
Popple, Inc.....	El Dorado.....	
Rogers Road Municipal Landfill.....	Jacksonville.....	
South 8th Street Landfill.....	West Memphis.....	
Vertac, Inc.....	Jacksonville.....	
Arizona:		
Apache Powder Co.....	St. David.....	
Hassayampa Landfill.....	Hassayampa.....	
Indian Bend Wash Area.....	Scottsdale/Tempe/Phoenix.....	
Litchfield Airport Area.....	Goodyear/Avondale.....	
Motorola, Inc. (52nd Street Plant).....	Phoenix.....	
Nineteenth Avenue Landfill.....	Phoenix.....	
Tucson International Airport Area.....	Tucson.....	

TABLE 1.—GENERAL SUPERFUND SECTION, OCTOBER 1992—Continued

State and site name	City/county	Notes
California:		
Advanced Micro Devices, Inc. (Building 915)	Sunnyvale	C
Advanced Micro Devices, Inc.	Sunnyvale	
Aerojet General Corp.	Rancho Cordova	
Applied Materials	Santa Clara	
Atlas Asbestos Mine	Fresno County	
Beckman Instruments (Porterville Plant)	Porterville	
Brown & Bryant, Inc. (Arvin Plant)	Arvin	
Celtor Chemical Works	Hoopa	C
Coalinga Asbestos Mine	Coalinga	
Coast Wood Preserving	Ukiah	
Crazy Horse Sanitary Landfill	Salinas	
CTS Printex, Inc.	Mountain View	C
Del Norte Pesticide Storage	Crescent City	C
Fairchild Semiconductor Corp. (Mountain View Plant) (once listed as Fairchild Camera & Instrument Corp. (Mountain View Plant))	Mountain View	
Fairchild Semiconductor Corp. (South San Jose Plant) (once listed as Fairchild Camera & Instrument Corp. (South San Jose Plant))	South San Jose	C
Firestone Tire & Rubber Co. (Salinas Plant)	Salinas	C
Fresno Municipal Sanitary Landfill	Fresno	
Hewlett-Packard (620-640 Page Mill Road)	Palo Alto	
Hexcel Corp.	Livermore	
Industrial Waste Processing	Fresno	
Intel Corp (Mountain View Plant)	Mountain View	
Intel Corp (Santa Clara III)	Santa Clara	C
Intel Magnetics	Santa Clara	C
Intersil Inc./Siemens Components	Cupertino	C
Iron Mountain Mine	Redding	
J.H. Baxter & Co.	Weed	
Jasco Chemical Corp.	Mountain View	
Koppers Co., Inc. (Oroville Plant)	Oroville	
Liquid Gold Oil Corp.	Richmond	
Lorentz Barrel & Drum Co.	San Jose	
Louisiana-Pacific Corp.	Oroville	
McColl	Fullerton	
McCormick & Baxter Creosoting Co.	Stockton	
MGM Brakes	Cloverdale	
Modesto Ground Water Contamination	Modesto	
Monolithic Memories	Sunnyvale	
Montrose Chemical Corp.	Torrance	
National Semiconductor Corp.	Santa Clara	
Newmark Ground Water Contamination	San Bernardino	
Operating Industries, Inc., Landfill	Monterey Park	
Pacific Coast Pipe Lines	Fillmore	
Purity Oil Sales, Inc.	Malaga	
Ralph Gray Trucking Co.	Westminster	
Raytheon Corp.	Mountain View	
San Fernando Valley (Area 1)	Los Angeles	
San Fernando Valley (Area 2)	Los Angeles/Glendale	
San Fernando Valley (Area 3)	Glendale	
San Fernando Valley (Area 4)	Los Angeles	
San Gabriel Valley (Area 1)	El Monte	
San Gabriel Valley (Area 2)	Baldwin Park Area	
San Gabriel Valley (Area 3)	Alhambra	
San Gabriel Valley (Area 4)	La Puente	
Selma Treating Co.	Selma	
Sola Optical USA, Inc.	Petaluma	C
South Bay Asbestos Area (once listed as Alviso Dumping Area)	Alviso	C
Southern California Edison Co (Visalia Poleyard)	Visalia	
Spectra-Physics, Inc.	Mountain View	C
Stringfellow	Glen Avon Heights	S
Sulphur Bank Mercury Mine	Clear Lake	
Synertek, Inc. (Building 1)	Santa Clara	C
T.H. Agriculture & Nutrition Co. (once listed as Thompson-Haywood Chemical Co.)	Fresno	
Teledyne Semiconductor	Mountain View	C
TRW Microwave, Inc. (Building 825)	Sunnyvale	
United Heckathorn Co.	Richmond	
Valley Wood Preserving, Inc.	Turlock	
Waste Disposal, Inc.	Santa Fe Springs	
Watkins-Johnson Co. (Stewart Division)	Scotts Valley	
Western Pacific Railroad Co.	Oroville	
Westinghouse Electric Corp. (Sunnyvale Plant)	Sunnyvale	
Colorado:		
Broderick Wood Products	Denver	
California Gulch	Leadville	
Central City—Clear Creek	Idaho Springs	
Chemical Sales Co.	Denver	
Denver Radium Site	Denver	
Eagle Mine	Minturn/Redcliff	
Lincoln Park	Canon City	

TABLE 1.—GENERAL SUPERFUND SECTION, OCTOBER 1992—Continued

State and site name	City/county	Notes
Lowry Landfill	Arapahoe County	
Marshall Landfill	Boulder County	S
Sand Creek Industrial	Commerce City	
Smuggler Mountain	Pitkin County	
Uravan Uranium Project (Union Carbide Corp.)	Uravan	
Woodbury Chemical Co.	Commerce City	C
Connecticut:		
Barkhamstead—New Hartford Landfill	Barkhamstead	
Beacon Heights Landfill	Beacon Falls	
Cheshire Ground Water Contamination (once listed as Cheshire Associates Property)	Cheshire	
Durham Meadows	Durham	
Gallup's Quarry	Plainfield	
Kellogg—Deering Well Field	Norwalk	
Laurel Park, Inc. (once listed as Laurel Park Landfill)	Naugatuck Borough	
Linemaster Switch Corp.	Woodstock	
Nutmeg Valley Road	Wolcott	
Old Southington Landfill	Southington	
Precision Plating Corp.	Vernon	
Revere Textile Prints Corp.	Sterling	C
Solvents Recovery Service of New England	Southington	
Yaworski Waste Lagoon	Canterbury	
Delaware:		
Army Creek Landfill (once listed as Delaware Sand & Gravel—Llangollen Army Creek Landfills)	New Castle County	
Chem-Solv, Inc.	Cheswold	
Coker's Sanitation Service Landfills	Kent County	
Delaware City PVC Plant (once listed as Stauffer Chemical Co.)	Delaware City	
Delaware Sand & Gravel Landfill (once listed as Delaware Sand & Gravel—Llangollen Army Creek Landfills)	New Castle County	
Dover Gas Light Co.	Dover	
E.I. Du Pont de Nemours & Co., Inc. (Newport Pigment Plant Landfill)	Newport	
Halby Chemical Co.	New Castle	
Harvey & Knott Drum, Inc.	Kirkwood	
Koppers Co., Inc. (Newport Plant)	Newport	
NCR Corp. (Millsboro Plant)	Millsboro	
New Castle Spill (once listed as TRIS Spill)	New Castle County	C
Seal and Limited	Mount Pleasant	C
Standard Chlorine of Delaware, Inc.	Delaware City	
Sussex County Landfill No. 5	Laurel	
Tybout's Corner Landfill	New Castle County	S
Tyler Refrigeration Pit	Smyrna	
Wildcat Landfill	Dover	C
Florida:		
Agrico Chemical Co.	Pensacola	
Airco Plating Co.	Miami	
Alpha Chemical Corp.	Galloway	C
American Creosote Works, Inc. (Pensacola Plant) (once listed as American Creosote Works)	Pensacola	
Anaconda Aluminum Co./Milgo Electronics Corp.	Miami	
Anodyne, Inc.	North Miami Beach	
B&B Chemical Co., Inc.	Hialeah	
Beulah Landfill	Pensacola	
BMI—Textron	Lake Park	
Broward County—21st Manor Dump	Fort Lauderdale	
Brown Wood Preserving	Live Oak	C
Cabot/Koppers	Gainesville	
Chemform, Inc.	Pompano Beach	
City Industries, Inc.	Orlando	
Coleman-Evans Wood Preserving Co.	Whitehouse	
Davie Landfill (once listed as Broward County Solid Waste Disposal Facility)	David	
Dubose Oil Products Co.	Cantonment	
Florida Steel Corp.	Indiantown	
Gold Coast Oil Corp.	Miami	C
Harris Corp. (Palm Bay Plant) (once listed as Harris Corp./General Development Utilities)	Palm Bay	
Helena Chemical Co. (Tampa Plant)	Tampa	
Hipps Road Landfill	Duval County	
Hollingsworth Solderless Terminal	Fort Lauderdale	
Kassaul-Kimerling Battery Disposal (once listed as Timber Lake Battery Disposal)	Tampa	
Madison County Sanitary Landfill	Madison	
Miami Drum Services (once listed as part of Biscayne Aquifer)	Miami	
Munisport Landfill	North Miami	
Northwest 58th Street Landfill (once listed as part of Biscayne Aquifer)	Hialeah	
Peak Oil Co./Bay Drum Co.	Tampa	
Pepper Steel & Alloys, Inc.	Medley	
Petroleum Products Corp.	Pembroke Park	
Pickettville Road Landfill	Jacksonville	
Pioneer Sand Co.	Warrington	C
Piper Aircraft/Vero Beach Water & Sewer Department	Vero Beach	

TABLE 1.—GENERAL SUPERFUND SECTION, OCTOBER 1992—Continued

State and site name	City/county	Notes
Reeves Southeast Galvanizing Corp.	Tampa	
Sapp Battery Salvage	Cottontale	
Schuylkill Metals Corp.	Plant City	
Sherwood Medical Industries	Deland	
Sixty-Second Street Dump	Tampa	
Standard Auto Bumper Corp.	Hialeah	
Sydney Mine Sludge Ponds	Brandon	
Taylor Road Landfill	Seffner	
Tower Chemical Co.	Clermont	
Whitehouse Oil Pits	Whitehouse	
Wilson Concepts of Florida, Inc.	Pompano Beach	C
Wingate Road Municipal Incinerator Dump	Fort Lauderdale	
Woodbury Chemical Co. (Princeton Plant)	Princeton	C
Yellow Water Road Dump	Baldwin	
Zellwood Ground Water Contamination	Zellwood	
Georgia:		
Cedartown Industries, Inc.	Cedartown	
Cedartown Municipal Landfill	Cedartown	
Diamond Shamrock Crop. Landfill	Cedartown	
Firestone Tire & Rubber Co. (Albany Plant)	Albany	
Hercules 009 Landfill	Brunswick	
Marzone Inc./Chevron Chemical Co.	Tifton	
Mathis Brothers Landfill (South Marble Top Road)	Kensington	
Monsanto Corp. (Augusta Plant)	Augusta	
Powersville Site	Peach County	
T.H. Agriculture & Nutrition Co. (Albany Plant)	Albany	
Woolfolk Chemical Works, Inc.	Fort Valley	
Guam: Ordof Landfill	Guam	C,S
Iowa:		
Aidex Corp.	Council Bluffs	C,S
Des Moines TCE (once listed as DICO)	Des Moines	
E.I. Du Pont de Nemours Co., Inc. (County Road X23)	West Point	
Electro-Coatings, Inc.	Cedar Rapids	
Fairfield Coal Gasification Plant	Fairfield	
Farmers' Mutual Cooperative	Hospers	
John Deere (Ottumwa Works Landfills)	Ottumwa	C
LaBounty Site	Charles City	C
Lawrence Todtz Farm	Camanche	C
Lehigh Portland Cement Co.	Mason City	
Mid-America Tanning Co.	Sergeant Bluff	
Midwest Manufacturing/North Farm	Kellogg	
Northwestern States Portland Cement Co.	Mason City	
Peoples Natural Gas Co.	Dubuque	
Red Oak City Landfill	Red Oak	
Shaw Avenue Dump	Charles City	
Sheller-Globe Corp. Disposal	Keokuk	
Vogel Paint & Wax Co.	Orange City	
White Farm Equipment Co. Dump	Charles City	
Idaho:		
Arrcom (Drexler Enterprises)	Rathdrum	C
Bunker Hill Mining & Metallurgical	Smelterville	
Eastern Michaud Flats Contamination	Pocatello	
Kerr-McGee Chemical Corp. (Soda Springs Plant)	Soda Springs	
Monsanto Chemical Co. (Soda Springs Plant)	Soda Springs	
Pacific Hide & Fur Recycling Co.	Pocatello	
Union Pacific Railroad Co.	Pocatello	
Illinois:		
A & F Material Reclaiming, Inc.	Greenup	C
Acme Solvent Reclaiming, Inc. (Morristown Plant)	Morristown	
Adams County Quincy Landfills 2 & 3	Quincy	
Amoco Chemicals (Joliet Landfill)	Joliet	
Beloit Corp.	Rockton	
Belvidere Municipal Landfill	Belvidere	C
Byron Salvage Yard	Byron	
Central Illinois Public Service Co.	Taylorville	
Cross Brothers Pail Recycling (Pembroke)	Pembroke Township	
DuPage County Landfill/Blackwell Forest Preserve	Warrenville	
Galesburg/Koppers Co.	Galesburg	
H.O.D. Landfill	Antioch	
Ilada Energy Co.	East Cape Girardeau	
Interstate Pollution Control, Inc.	Rockford	
Johns-Manville Corp.	Waukegan	C
Kerr-McGee (Kress Creek/West Branch of DuPage River)	DuPage County	
Kerr-McGee (Reed-Keppler Park)	West Chicago	
Kerr-McGee (Residential Areas)	W Chic/DuPage County	
Kerr-McGee (Sewage Treatment Plant)	West Chicago	
LaSalle Electric Utilities	LaSalle	
Lenz Oil Service, Inc.	Lemont	
MIG/Dewane Landfill	Belvidere	
NL Industries/Taracorp Lead Smelter	Granite City	

TABLE 1.—GENERAL SUPERFUND SECTION, OCTOBER 1992—Continued

State and site name	City/county	Notes
Ottawa Radiation Areas	Ottawa	
Outboard Marine Corp.	Waukegan	S
Pagel's Pit	Rockford	
Parsons Casket Hardware Co.	Belvidere	
Southeast Rockford Ground Water Contamination	Rockford	
Tri-County Landfill Co./Waste Management of Illinois, Inc.	South Elgin	
Velsicol Chemical Corp. (Illinois)	Marshall	
Wauconda Sand & Gravel	Wauconda	
Woodstock Municipal Landfill	Woodstock	
Yeoman Creek Landfill	Waukegan	
Indiana:		
American Chemical Service, Inc.	Griffith	
Bennett Stone Quarry	Bloomington	
Carter Lee Lumber Co.	Indianapolis	
Columbus Old Municipal Landfill ; 1	Columbus	
Conrail Rail Yard (Elkhart)	Elkhart	
Continental Steel Corp.	Kokomo	
Douglass Road/Uniroyal, Inc., Landfill	Mishawaka	
Envirochem Corp.	Zionsville	
Fisher-Calo	LaPorte	
Fort Wayne Reduction Dump	Fort Wayne	
Galen Myers Dump/Drum Salvage	Osceola	
Himco Dump	Elkhart	
Lake Sandy Jo (M&M Landfill) (once listed as Lake Sandy Jo)	Gary	
Lakeland Disposal Service, Inc.	Claypool	
Lemon Lane Landfill	Bloomington	
Main Street Well Field	Elkhart	
Marion (Bragg) Dump	Marion	
MIDCO I	Gary	
MIDCO II	Gary	
Neal's Dump (Spencer)	Spencer	
Neal's Landfill (Bloomington)	Bloomington	
Ninth Avenue Dump	Gary	
Northside Sanitary Landfill, Inc.	Zionsville	
Prestolite Battery Division	Vincennes	
Reilly Tar & Chemical Corp. (Indianapolis Plant)	Indianapolis	
Seymour Recycling Corp.	Seymour	S
Southside Sanitary Landfill	Indianapolis	
Tippecanoe Sanitary Landfill, Inc.	Lafayette	
Tri-State Plating	Columbus	C
Waste, Inc., Landfill	Michigan City	
Wayne Waste Oil	Columbia City	
Whiteford Sales & Service Inc./National Lease	South Bend	
Kansas:		
29th & Mead Ground Water Contamination	Wichita	
57th and North Broadway Streets Site	Wichita Heights	
Arkansas City Dump	Arkansas City	C,S
Cherokee County (once listed as Tar Creek, Cherokee County)	Cherokee County	
Doopke Disposal (Holliday)	Johnson County	
Hydro-Flex Inc.	Topeka	C
Obee Road	Hutchinson	
Pester Refinery Co.	El Dorado	
Strother Field Industrial Park	Cowley County	
Kentucky:		
A.L. Taylor (Valley of Drums)	Brooks	C,S
Airco	Calvert City	
B.F. Goodrich	Calvert City	
Brantley Landfill	Island	
Caldwell Lace Leather Co., Inc.	Auburn	
Distler Brickyard	West Point	
Distler Farm	Jefferson County	C
Fort Hartford Coal Co. Stone Quarry	Olaton	
General Tire & Rubber Co. (Mayfield Landfill)	Mayfield	
Green River Disposal, Inc.	Maceo	
Howe Valley Landfill	Howe Valley	
Lee's Lane Landfill	Louisville	C
Maxey Flats Nuclear Disposal	Hillsboro	
National Electric Coil Co./Cooper Industries	Dayhoit	
Newport Dump	Newport	C
Red Penn Sanitation Co. Landfill	PeeWee Valley	
Smith's Form	Brooks	
Tri-City Disposal Co.	Shepherdsville	
Louisiana:		
American Creosote Works, Inc. (Winnfield Plant)	Winnfield	
Bayou Bonfouca	Slidell	
Bayou Sorrel Site	Bayou Sorrel	C
Cleve Reber	Sorrento	
Combustion, Inc.	Denham Springs	
D.L. Mud, Inc.	Abbeville	
Dutchtown Treatment Plant	Ascension Parish	

TABLE 1.—GENERAL SUPERFUND SECTION, OCTOBER 1992—Continued

State and site name	City/county	Notes
Gulf Coast Vacuum Services.....	Abbeville.....	
Old Inger Oil Refinery.....	Darrow.....	S
PAB Oil & Chemical Service, Inc.....	Abbeville.....	
Petro-Processors of Louisiana Inc.....	Scotlandville.....	
Massachusetts:		
Atlas Tack Corp.....	Fairhaven.....	
Baird & McGuire.....	Holbrook.....	
Cannon Engineering Corp. (CEC).....	Bridgewater.....	C
Charles-George Reclamation Trust Landfill.....	Tyngsborough.....	
Groveland Wells.....	Groveland.....	
Haverhill Municipal Landfill.....	Haverhill.....	
Hocomonco Pond.....	Westborough.....	
Industri-Plex (once listed as Mark Phillip Trust).....	Woburn.....	
Iron Horse Park.....	Billerica.....	
New Bedford Site.....	New Bedford.....	S
Norwood PCBs.....	Norwood.....	
Nyanza Chemical Waste Dump.....	Ashland.....	
Plymouth Harbor/Cannon Engineering Corp. (once listed as Plymouth Harbor/Cordage).....	Plymouth.....	C
PSC Resources.....	Palmer.....	
Re-Solve, Inc.....	Dartmouth.....	
Rose Disposal Pit.....	Lanesboro.....	
Salem Acres.....	Salem.....	
Shpack Landfill.....	Norton/Attleboro.....	
Silresim Chemical Corp.....	Lowell.....	
Sullivan's Ledge.....	New Bedford.....	
W.R. Grace & Co. Inc. (Acton Plant).....	Acton.....	
Wells G&H.....	Woburn.....	
Maryland:		
Bush Valley Landfill.....	Abingdon.....	
Kane & Lombard Street Drums.....	Baltimore.....	
Limestone Road.....	Cumberland.....	
Mid-Atlantic Wood Preservers, Inc.....	Harmans.....	
Sand, Gravel & Stone.....	Elkton.....	
Southern Maryland Wood Treating.....	Hollywood.....	
Woodlawn County Landfill.....	Woodlawn.....	
Maine:		
McKin Co.....	Gray.....	C
O'Connor Co.....	Augusta.....	
Pinette's Salvage Yard.....	Washburn.....	
Saco Municipal Landfill.....	Saco.....	
Saco Tannery Waste Pits.....	Saco.....	
Union Chemical Co., Inc.....	South Hope.....	
Winthrop Landfill.....	Winthrop.....	
Michigan:		
Adam's Plating.....	Lansing.....	
Albion-Sheridan Township Landfill.....	Albion.....	
Allied Paper, Inc./Portage Creek/Kalamazoo River.....	Kalamazoo.....	
American Anodco, Inc.....	Ionia.....	
Anderson Development Co.....	Adrian.....	
Auto Ion Chemicals, Inc.....	Kalamazoo.....	
Avenue "E" Ground Water Contamination.....	Traverse City.....	
Barrels, Inc.....	Lansing.....	
Bendix Corp./Allied Automotive.....	St. Joseph.....	
Berlin & Farro.....	Swartz Creek.....	
Bofors Nobel, Inc.....	Muskegon.....	
Burrows Sanitation.....	Hartford.....	
Butterworth ;2 Landfill.....	Grand Rapids.....	
Cannelton Industries, Inc.....	Saulte Sainte Marie.....	
Carter Industries, Inc.....	Detroit.....	
Cemetery Dump.....	Rose Center.....	C
Charlevoix Municipal Well.....	Charlevoix.....	C
Chem Central.....	Wyoming Township.....	
Clare Water Supply.....	Clare.....	
Cliff/Dow Dump.....	Marquette.....	
Duell & Gardner Landfill.....	Dalton Township.....	
Electrovoice.....	Buchanan.....	
Folkertsma Refuse.....	Grand Rapids.....	
Forest Waste Products.....	Otisville.....	
G&H Landfill.....	Utica.....	
Grand Traverse Overall Supply Co.....	Greilickville.....	C
Gratiot County Landfill.....	St. Louis.....	S
H. Brown Co., Inc.....	Grand Rapids.....	
Hedblum Industries.....	Oscoda.....	
Hi-Mill Manufacturing Co.....	Highland.....	
Ionia City Landfill.....	Ionia.....	
J&L Landfill.....	Rochester Hills.....	
K&L Avenue Landfill.....	Oshetemo Township.....	
Kaydon Corp.....	Muskegon.....	
Kent City Mobile Home Park.....	Kent City.....	

TABLE 1.—GENERAL SUPERFUND SECTION, OCTOBER 1992—Continued

State and site name	City/county	Notes
Kentwood Landfill	Kentwood	
Kysor Industrial Corp	Cadillac	
Liquid Disposal, Inc.	Utica	
Mason County Landfill	Père Marquette Twp	
McGraw Edison Corp	Albion	
Metal Working Shop	Lake Ann	C
Metamora Landfill	Metamora	
Michigan Disposal Service (Cork Street Landfill)	Kalamazoo	
Motor Wheel, Inc.	Lansing	
Muskegon Chemical Co	Whitehall	
North Bronson Industrial Area	Bronson	
Northern Plating	Cadillac	
Novaco Industries	Temperance	C
Organic Chemicals, Inc.	Grandville	
Ossineke Ground Water Contamination	Ossineke	
Ott/Story/Cordova Chemical Co	Dalton Township	
Packaging Corp. of America	Filer City	
Parsons Chemical Works, Inc.	Grand Ledge	
Peerless Plating Co	Muskegon	
Petoskey Municipal Well Field	Petoskey	
Rasmussen's Dump	Green Oak Township	
Rockwell International Corp. (Allegan Plant)	Allegan	
Rose Township Dump	Rose Township	
Roto-Finish Co., Inc.	Kalamazoo	
SCA Independent Landfill	Muskegon Heights	
Shiawassee River	Howell	
South Macomb Disposal Authority (Landfills :9 and :9a)	Macomb Township	
Southwest Ottawa County Landfill	Park Township	
Sparta Landfill	Sparta Township	
Spartan Chemical Co	Wyoming	
Spiegelberg Landfill	Green Oak Township	
Springfield Township Dump	Davisburg	
State Disposal Landfill, Inc.	Grand Rapids	
Sturgis Municipal Wells	Sturgis	
Tar Lake	Mancelona Township	
Thermo-Chem, Inc.	Muskegon	
Torch Lake	Houghton County	
U.S. Aviox	Howard Township	
Velsicol Chemical Corp. (Michigan)	St. Louis	C
Verona Well Field	Battle Creek	
Wash King Laundry	Pleasant Plains Twp	
Waste Management of Michigan (Holland Lagoons)	Holland	
Minnesota:		
Adrian Municipal Well Field	Adrian	C
Agate Lake Scrapyard	Fairview Township	
Arrowhead Refinery Co	Hermantown	
Boise Cascade/Onan Corp./Medtronics, Inc.	Fridley	C
Boise Cascade/Onan Corp./Medtronics, Inc.	Fridley	C
Burlington Northern (Brainerd/Baxter Plant)	Brainerd/Baxter	
Dakhue Sanitary Landfill	Cannon Falls	
East Bethel Demolition Landfill	East Bethel Township	
FMC Corp. (Fridley Plant)	Fridley	C
Freeway Sanitary Landfill	Burnsville	
General Mills/Henkel Corp	Minneapolis	C
Joslyn Manufacturing & Supply Co	Brooklyn Center	
Koch Refining Co./N-Ren Corp	Pine Bend	
Koppers Coke	St. Paul	
Kummer Sanitary Landfill	Bemidji	
Kurt Manufacturing Co	Fridley	
LaGrand Sanitary Landfill	LaGrand Township	
Lehillier/Mankato Site	Lehillier/Mankato	C
Long Prairie Ground Water Contamination	Long Prairie	
MacGillis & Gibbs Co./Bell Lumber & Pole Co	New Brighton	
New Brighton/Arden Hills	New Brighton	
NL Industries/Taracorp/Golden Auto (once listed as National Lead Taracorp)	St. Louis Park	
Nutting Truck & Caster Co	Fairbault	C
Oak Grove Sanitary Landfill	Oak Grove Township	
Oakdale Dump	Oakdale	
Olmstead County Sanitary Landfill	Oronoco	
Perham Arsenic Site	Perham	
Pine Bend Sanitary Landfill (once listed as Pine Bend Sanitary Landfill/Crosby American Demolition Landfill)	Dakota County	
Reilly Tar & Chemical Corp. (St. Louis Park Plant)	St. Louis Park	S
Ritari Post & Pole	Sebek	
South Andover Site (once listed as Andover Sites)	Andover	
St. Augusta Sanitary Landfill/Engen Dump (once listed as St. Augusta Sanitary Landfill/St. Cloud Dump)	St. Augusta Township	
St. Louis River Site	St. Louis County	
St. Regis Paper Co	Cass Lake	
University of Minnesota (Rosemount Research Center)	Rosemount	

TABLE 1.—GENERAL SUPERFUND SECTION, OCTOBER 1992—Continued

State and site name	City/county	Notes
Waite Park Wells	Waite Park	
Washington County Landfill	Lake Elmo	C
Waste Disposal Engineering	Andover	
Whittaker Corp	Minneapolis	C
Windom Dump	Windom	C
Missouri:		
Bee Cee Manufacturing Co.	Malden	
Big River Mine Tailings/St. Joe Minerals Corp.	Desloge	
Conservation Chemical Co.	Kansas City	C
Ellisville Site	Ellisville	S
Fulbright Landfill	Springfield	C
Kern-Pest Laboratories	Cape Girardeau	
Lee Chemical	Liberty	
Minker/Stout/Romaine Creek (once listed as Arena 2: Fills 1 & 2)	Imperial	
Missouri Electric Works	Cape Girardeau	
North-U Drive Well Contamination	Springfield	
Oronogo-Duenweg Mining Belt	Jasper County	
Quality Plating	Sikeston	
Shenandoah Stables (once listed as Arena 1: Shenandoah Stables)	Moscow Mills	
Solid State Circuits, Inc.	Republic	
St. Louis Airport/Hazelwood Interim Storage/Futura Coatings Co.	St. Louis County	
Syntex Facility	Verona	
Times Beach Site	Times Beach	
Valley Park TCE	Valley Park	
Westlake Landfill	Bridgeton	
Wheeling Disposal Service Co. Landfill	Amazonia	
Mississippi:		
Flowood Site	Flowood	S
Newsom Brothers/Old Reichhold Chemicals, Inc.	Columbia	
Montana:		
Anaconda Co. Smelter	Anaconda	
East Helena Site (once listed as East Helena Smelter)	East Helena	
Idaho Pole Co.	Bozeman	
Libby Ground Water Contamination	Libby	
Milltown Reservoir Sediments	Milltown	
Montana Pole and Treating	Butte	
Mouat Industries	Columbus	
Silver Bow Creek/Butte Area (once listed as Silver Bow Creek)	Sil Bow/Deer Lodge	
North Carolina:		
ABC One Hour Cleaners	Jacksonville	
Aberdeen Pesticide Dumps	Aberdeen	
Benfield Industries, Inc.	Hazelwood	
Bypass 601 Ground Water Contamination	Concord	
Cape Fear Wood Preserving	Fayetteville	
Carolina Transformer Co.	Fayetteville	
Celanese Corp. (Shelby Fiber Operations)	Shelby	
Charles Macon Lagoon & Drum Storage	Cordova	
Chemtronics, Inc.	Swannanoa	
FCX, Inc. (Statesville Plant)	Statesville	
FCX, Inc. (Washington Plant)	Washington	
Geigy Chemical Corp. (Aberdeen Plant)	Aberdeen	
Hevi-Duty Electric Co.	Goldsboro	
Jadco-Hughes Facility	Belmont	
JFD Electronics/Channel Master	Oxford	
Koppers Co., Inc. (Morrisville Plant)	Morrisville	
Martin-Marietta, Sodyeco, Inc.	Charlotte	
National Starch & Chemical Corp.	Salisbury	
North Carolina State University (Lot 86, Farm Unit :1)	Raleigh	
New Hanover County Airport Burn Pit	Wilmington	
Potter's Septic Tank Service Pits	Macon	
North Dakota:		
Arsenic Trioxide Site	Southeastern ND	C,S
Minot Landfill	Minot	
Nebraska:		
10th Street Site	Columbus	
Cieburn Street Well	Grand Island	
Hastings Ground Water Contamination	Hastings	
Lindsay Manufacturing Co.	Lindsay	
Nebraska Ordnance Plant (Former)	Mead	
Sherwood Medical Co.	Norfolk	
Waverly Ground Water Contamination	Waverly	
New Hampshire:		
Auburn Road Landfill	Londonderry	
Coakley Landfill	North Hampton	
Dover Municipal Landfill	Dover	
Fletcher's Paint Works & Storage	Millford	
Kearsarge Metallurgical Corp. (once listed as Kearsage Metallurgical Corp.)	Conway	
Keele Environmental Services (once listed as KES)	Epping	
Mottolo Pig Farm	Raymond	
New Hampshire Plating Co.	Merrimack	

TABLE 1.—GENERAL SUPERFUND SECTION, OCTOBER 1992—Continued

State and site name	City/county	Notes
Ottati & Gross/Kingston Steel Drum (once listed as Ottati & Gross)	Kingston	
Savage Municipal Water Supply	Milford	
Somersworth Sanitary Landfill	Somersworth	
South Municipal Water Supply Well	Peterborough	
Sylvester	Nashua	C,S
Tibbetts Road	Barrington	
Tinkham Garage	Londonderry	
Town Garage/Radio Beacon	Londonderry	C
New Jersey:		
A.O. Polymer	Sparta Township	
American Cyanamid Co.	Bound Brook	
Asbestos Dump	Millington	
Bog Creek Farm	Howell Township	
Brick Township Landfill	Brick Township	
Bridgeport Rental & Oil Services	Bridgeport	
Brook Industrial Park	Bound Brook	
Burnt Fly Bog	Marlboro Township	
Caldwell Trucking Co.	Fairfield	
Chemical Control	Elizabeth	
Chemical Insecticide Corp.	Edison Township	
Chemical Leaman Tank Lines, Inc. (once listed as Chemical Leaman Tank Liners, Inc.)	Bridgeport	
Chemsol, Inc.	Piscataway	
Ciba-Geigy Corp. (once listed as Toms River Chemical)	Toms River	
Cinnamons Township (Block 702) Ground Water Contamination	Cinnamons Township	
Combe Fill North Landfill	Mount Olive Township	
Combe Fill South Landfill	Chester Township	
Cosden Chemical Coatings Corp.	Beverly	
CPS/Madison Industries	Old Bridge Township	
Curcio Scrap Metal, Inc.	Saddle Brook Township	
D'Imperio Property	Hamilton Township	
Dayco Corp./L.E. Carpenter Co.	Wharton Borough	
De Rewal Chemical Co.	Kingwood Township	
Delilah Road	Egg Harbor Township	
Denzer & Schafer X-Ray Co.	Bayville	
Diamond Alkali Co.	Newark	
Dover Municipal Well #4	Dover Township	
Ellis Property	Evesham Township	
Evor Phillips Leasing	Old Bridge Township	
Ewan Property	Shamong Township	
Fair Lawn Well Field	Fair Lawn	
Florence Land Recontouring Landfill	Florence Township	
Fried Industries	East Brunswick Township	
Garden State Cleaners Co.	Minotola	
GEMS Landfill	Gloucester Township	
Glen Ridge Radium Site	Glen Ridge	
Global Sanitary Landfill	Old Bridge Township	
Goose Farm	Plumstead Township	
Helen Kramer Landfill	Mantua Township	
Hercules, Inc. (Gibbstown Plant)	Gibbstown	
Higgins Disposal	Kingston	
Higgins Farm	Franklin Township	
Hopkins Farm	Plumstead Township	
Imperial Oil Co., Inc./Champion Chemicals	Morganville	
Industrial Latex Corp.	Wallington Borough	
Jackson Township Landfill	Jackson Township	
JIS Landfill	Jamesburg/S. Brunswick	
Kauffman & Minter, Inc.	Jobstown	
Kin-Buc Landfill	Edison Township	
King of Prussia	Winslow Township	
Landfill & Development Co.	Mount Holly	
Lang Property	Pemberton Township	
Lipari Landfill	Pitman	
Lodi Municipal Well	Lodi	
Lone Pine Landfill	Freehold Township	
Mannheim Avenue Dump	Galloway Township	
Maywood Chemical Co.	Maywood/Rochelle Park	
Metaltec/Aerosystems	Franklin Borough	
Monitor Devices/Intercircuits Inc.	Wall Township	
New Jersey:		
Monroe Township Landfill	Monroe Township	
Montclair/West Orange Radium Site	Montclair/W. Orange	
Montgomery Township Housing Development	Montgomery Township	
Myers Property	Franklin Township	
Nascolite Corp.	Millville	
NL Industries	Pedricktown	
Pepe Field	Boonton	
Pajak Farm	Plumstead Township	
PJP Landfill	Jersey City	
Pohatcong Valley Ground Water Contamination	Warren County	
Pomona Oaks Residential Wells	Galloway Township	C

TABLE 1.—GENERAL SUPERFUND SECTION, OCTOBER 1992—Continued

State and site name	City/county	Notes
Price Landfill	Pleasantville	S
Radiation Technology, Inc	Rockaway Township	
Reich Farms	Pleasant Plains	
Renora, Inc	Edison Township	
Ringwood Mines/Landfill	Ringwood Borough	
Rockaway Borough Well Field	Rockaway Township	
Rockaway Township Wells	Rockaway	
Rocky Hill Municipal Well	Rocky Hill Borough	
Roebing Steel Co	Florence	
Sayreville Landfill	Sayreville	
Scientific Chemical Processing	Carlstadt	
Sharkey Landfill	Parsippany/Troy Hills	
Shieldalloy Corp	Newfield Borough	
South Brunswick Landfill	South Brunswick	
South Jersey Clothing Co	Minotola	
Spence Farm	Plumstead Township	
Swope Oil & Chemical Co	Pennsauken	
Syncon Resins	South Kearney	
Tabernacle Drum Dump	Tabernacle Township	
U.S. Radium Corp	Orange	
Universal Oil Products (Chemical Division)	East Rutherford	
Upper Deerfield Township Sanitary Landfill	Upper Deerfield Township	
Ventron/Velsicol	Wood Ridge Borough	
Vineland Chemical Co., Inc.	Vineland	
Vineland State School	Vineland	C
Waldick Aerospace Devices, Inc	Wall Township	
White Chemical Corp	Newark	H
Williams Property	Swainton	
Wilson Farm	Plumstead Township	
Witco Chemical Corp. (Oakland Plant)	Oakland	C
Woodland Route 532 Dump	Woodland Township	
Woodland Route 72 Dump	Woodland Township	
New Mexico:		
AT & SF (Clovis)	Clovis	
Cimarron Mining Corp	Carrizozo	C
Cleveland Mill	Silver City	
Homestake Mining Co	Milan	
Prewitt Abandoned Refinery	Prewitt	
South Valley	Albuquerque	S
United Nuclear Corp	Church Rock	
Nevada:		
Carson River Mercury Site	Lyon/Churchill County	
New York:		
Action Anodizing, Plating, & Polishing Corp	Copiapue	C
American Thermostat Co	South Cairo	
Anchor Chemicals	Hicksville	
Applied Environmental Services	Glenwood Landing	
Batavia Landfill	Batavia	
BioClinical Laboratories, Inc	Bohemia	C
Brewster Well Field	Putnam County	
Byron Barrel & Drum	Byron	
C & J Disposal Leasing Co. Dump	Hamilton	
Carroll & Dubies Sewage Disposal	Port Jervis	
Circuitron Corp	East Farmingdale	
Claremont Polychemical	Old Bethpage	
Clothier Disposal	Town of Granby	
Colesville Municipal Landfill	Town of Colesville	
Conklin Dumps	Conklin	
Cortese Landfill	Village of Narrowsburg	
Endicott Village Well Field	Village of Endicott	
Facet Enterprises, Inc	Elmira	
FMC Corp. (Dublin Road Landfill)	Town of Shelby	
Forest Glen Mobile Home Subdivision	Niagara Falls	H
Fulton Terminals	Fulton	
GE Moreau	South Glen Falls	
General Motors (Central Foundry Division)	Massena	
Genzale Plating Co	Franklin Square	
Goldisc Recordings, Inc	Holbrook	
Haviland Complex	Town of Hyde Park	
Hertel Landfill	Plattekill	
Hooker (102nd Street)	Niagara Falls	
Hooker (Hyde Park)	Niagara Falls	
Hooker (S Area)	Niagara Falls	
Hooker Chemical/Ruco Polymer Corp	Hicksville	
Hudson River PCBs	Hudson River	
Islip Municipal Sanitary Landfill	Islip	
Johnstown City Landfill	Town of Johnstown	
Jones Chemicals, Inc	Caledonia	
Jones Sanitation	Hyde Park	
Katonah Municipal Well	Town of Bedford	C

TABLE 1.—GENERAL SUPERFUND SECTION, OCTOBER 1992—Continued

State and site name	City/county	Notes
Kenmark Textile Corp.	Farmingdale	
Kentucky Avenue Well Field	Horseheads	
Li Tungsten Corp.	Glen Cove	
Liberty Industrial Finishing	Farmingdale	
Love Canal	Niagara Falls	
Ludlow Sand & Gravel	Clayville	
Malta Rocket Fuel Area	Malta	
Marathon Battery Corp.	Cold Springs	
Mattiace Petrochemical Co., Inc.	Glen Cove	
Mercury Refining, Inc.	Colonia	
Nepera Chemical Co., Inc.	Maybrook	
Niagara County Refuse	Wheatfield	
Niagara Mohawk Power Corp. (Saratoga Springs Plant)	Saratoga Springs	
North Sea Municipal Landfill	North Sea	
Old Bethpage Landfill	Oyster Bay	
Olean Well Field	Olean	
Pasley Solvents & Chemicals, Inc.	Hempstead	
Pollution Abatement Services	Oswego	S
Port Washington Landfill	Port Washington	
Preferred Plating Corp.	Farmingdale	
Radium Chemical Co., Inc.	New York City	H
Ramapo Landfill	Ramapo	
Richardson Hill Road Landfill/Pond	Sidney Center	
Robintech, Inc./National Pipe Co.	Town of Vestal	
Rosen Brothers Scrap Yard/Dump	Cortland	
Howe Industries Ground Water Contamination	Noyack/Sag Harbor	
Sarney Farm	Amenia	
Sealand Restoration, Inc.	Lisbon	
Sidney Landfill	Sidney	
Sinclair Refinery	Wellsville	
SMS Instruments, Inc.	Deer Park	
Solvent Savers	Lincklaen	
Suffern Village Well Field	Village of Suffern	C
Syosset Landfill	Oyster Bay	
Tri-Cities Barrel Co., Inc.	Port Crane	
Tronic Plating Co., Inc.	Farmingdale	
Vestal Water Supply Well 1-1 (once listed with Well 4-2 as one site)	Vestal	
Vestal Water Supply Well 4-2 (once listed with Well 1-1 as one site)	Vestal	
Volney Municipal Landfill	Town of Volney	
Warwick Landfill	Warwick	
Wide Beach Development	Brant	C
York Oil Co.	Moir	
Ohio:		
Allied Chemical & Ironton Coke	Ironton	
Alco Anaconda	Gnadenhutten	
Arcanum Iron & Metal	Darke County	
Big D Campground	Kingsville	
Bowers Landfill	Circleville	
Buckeye Reclamation	St. Clairsville	
Chem-Dyne	Hamilton	C,S
Coshocton Landfill	Franklin Township	
E.H. Schilling Landfill	Hamilton Township	
Fields Brook	Ashtabula	
Fultz Landfill	Jackson Township	
Industrial Excess Landfill	Uniontown	
Laskin/Poplar Oil Co. (once listed as Poplar Oil Co.)	Jefferson Township	
Miami County Incinerator	Troy	
Nease Chemical	Salem	
New Lyme Landfill	New Lyme	
Old Mill (once listed as Rock Creek/Jack Webb)	Rock Creek	C
Ormet Corp.	Hannibal	
Powell Road Landfill	Dayton	
Pristine, Inc.	Reading	
Reilly Tar & Chemical Corp. (Dover Plant)	Dover	
Republic Steel Corp. Quarry	Elyria	
Sanitary Landfill Co. (Industrial Waste Disposal Co., Inc.)	Dayton	
Skinner Landfill	West Chester	
South Point Plant	South Point	
Summit National	Deerfield Township	
TRW, Inc. (Minerva Plant)	Minerva	
United Scrap Lead Co., Inc.	Troy	
Van Dale Junkyard	Manetta	
Zanesville Well Field	Zanesville	
Oklahoma:		
Compass Industries (Avery Drive) (once listed as Compass Industries)	Tulsa	C
Double Eagle Refinery Co.	Oklahoma City	
Fourth Street Abandoned Refinery	Oklahoma City	
Hardage/Criner (once listed as Criner/Hardage Waste Disposal)	Criner	
Mosley Road Sanitary Landfill	Oklahoma City	
Oklahoma Refining Co.	Cyril	

TABLE 1.—GENERAL SUPERFUND SECTION, OCTOBER 1992—Continued

State and site name	City/county	Notes
Sand Springs Petrochemical Complex	Sand Springs	
Tar Creek (Ottawa County)	Ottawa County	
Tenth Street Dump/Junkyard	Oklahoma City	
Oregon:		
Allied Plating, Inc.	Portland	
Gould, Inc.	Portland	
Joseph Forest Products	Joseph	
Martin-Marietta Aluminum Co.	The Dalles	
Northwest Pipe & Casing Co.	Clackamas	
Teledyne Wah Chang	Albany	
Union Pacific Railroad Co. Tie Treating Plant	The Dalles	
United Chrome Products, Inc.	Corvallis	C
Pennsylvania:		
A.I.W. Frank/Mid-County Mustang	Exton	
Aladdin Plating	Scott Township	
Ambler Asbestos Piles	Ambler	
AMP, Inc. (Glen Rock Facility)	Glen Rock	
Austin Avenue Radiation Site	Delaware County	H
Avco Lycoming (Williamsport Division)	Williamsport	
Bally Ground Water Contamination	Bally Borough	
Bell Landfill	Terry Township	
Bendix Flight Systems Division	Bridgewater Township	
Berkley Products Co. Dump	Denver	
Berks Landfill	Spring Township	
Berks Sand Pit	Longswamp Township	
Blosenski Landfill	West Cain Township	
Boarhead Farms	Bridgeton Township	
Brodhead Creek	Stroudsburg	
Brown's Battery Braeking	Shoemakersville	
Bruin Lagoon	Bruin Borough	C
Butler Mine Tunnel	Pittston	
Butz Landfill	Stroudsburg	
C & D Recycling	Foster Township	
Centre County Kepone	State College Borough	
Commodore Semiconductor Group	Lower Providence Township	
Craig Farm Drum	Parker	
Crater Resources, Inc./Keystone Coke Co./Alan Wood Steel Co.	Upper Merion Twp	
Crossley Farm	Hereford Township	
Croydon TCE	Croydon	
Cryochem, Inc.	Worman	
Delta Quarries & Disposal, Inc./Stotter Landfill	Antis/Logan Townships	
Dorney Road Landfill	Upper Macungie Township	
Douglassville Disposal	Douglassville	
Drake Chemical	Lock Haven	
Dublin TCE Site	Dublin Borough	
East Mount Zion	Springettsbury Township	
Eastern Diversified Metals	Hometown	
Elizabethtown Landfill	Elizabethtown	
Fischer & Porter Co.	Warminster	
Havertown PCP	Haverford	
Hebelka Auto Salvage Yard	Weisenberg Township	
Heleva Landfill	North Whitehall Township	
Heilertown Manufacturing Co.	Heilertown	
Henderson Road	Upper Merion Township	
Hranica Landfill	Buffalo Township	
Hunterstown Road	Straban Township	
Industrial Lane	Williams Township	
Jacks Creek/Sitkin Smelting & Refining, Inc.	Maitland	
Keystone Sanitation Landfill	Union Township	
Kimberton Site	Kimberton Borough	
Lackawanna Refuse	Old Forge Borough	
Lindane Dump	Harrison Township	
Lord-Shope Landfill	Girard Township	
Malvern TCE	Malvern	
McAdoo Associates	McAdoo Borough	S
Metal Banks	Philadelphia	
Metropolitan Mirror and Glass Co., Inc.	Frackville	
Middletown Air Field	Middletown	
Mill Creek Dump	Erie	
Modern Sanitation Landfill	Lower Windsor Township	
Moyers Landfill	Eagleview	
MW Manufacturing (once listed as Domino Salvage Yard)	Valley Township	
North Penn—Area 1 (once listed as Gentle Cleaners, Inc./Souderton Granite Knitting Mills, Inc.)	Souderton	
North Penn—Area 12 (once listed as Transicoll, Inc.)	Worcester	
North Penn—Area 2 (once listed as Ametsk, Inc. (Hunter Hatfield Spring Division))	Hatfield	
North Penn—Area 5 (once listed as American Electronics Laboratories)	Montgomery Township	
North Penn—Area 6 (once listed as J.W. Rex Co./Allied Paint Manufacturing Co., Inc./Keystone Hydraulics)	Lansdale	
North Penn—Area 7 (once listed as Spra-Fin, Inc.)	North Wales	

TABLE 1.—GENERAL SUPERFUND SECTION, OCTOBER 1992—Continued

State and site name	City/county	Notes
Novak Sanitary Landfill	South Whitehall Township	
Occidental Chemical Corp./Firestone Tire & Rubber Co	Lower Pottsgrove Township	
Ohio River Park	Neville Island	
Old City of York Landfill	Seven Valleys	
Osborne Landfill	Grove City	
Palmerton Zinc Pile	Palmerton	
Paoli Rail Yard	Paoli	
Publicker Industries Inc.	Philadelphia	
Raymark	Hatboro	
Recticon/Allied Steel Corp.	East Coventry Township	
Resin Disposal	Jefferson Borough	
Revere Chemical Co.	Nockamixon Township	
River Road Landfill (Waste Management, Inc.)	Hermitage	
Rodale Manufacturing Co., Inc.	Emmaus Borough	
Route 940 Drum Dump (once listed as Pocono Summit)	Pocono Summit	C
Saegertown Industrial Area	Saegertown	
Shriver's Corner	Straban Township	
Stanley Kessler	King of Prussia	
Strasburg Landfill	Newlin Township	
Taylor Borough Dump	Taylor Borough	C
Tonolli Corp.	Nesquehoning	
Tyson's Dump	Upper Merion Township	
Walsh Landfill	Honeybrook Township	
Westinghouse Electric Corp. (Sharon Plant)	Sharon	
Westinghouse Elevator Co. Plant	Gettysburg	
Whitmoyer Laboratories	Jackson Township	
William Dick Lagoons	West Caln Township	
York County Solid Waste and Refuse Authority Landfill	Hopewell Township	
Puerto Rico:		
Barceloneta Landfill	Florida Afuera	
Fibers Public Supply Wells	Jobos	
Frontera Creek	Rio Abajo	
GE Wiring Devices	Juana Diaz	
Juncos Landfill	Juncos	
RCA Del Caribe	Barceloneta	
Upjohn Facility	Barceloneta	
Vega Alta Public Supply Wells	Vega Alta	
Rhode Island:		
Central Landfill	Johnston	
Davis (GSR) Landfill	Glocester	
Davis Liquid Waste	Smithfield	
Landfill & Resource Recovery, Inc. (L&RR)	North Smithfield	
Peterson/Puritan, Inc.	Lincoln/Cumberland	
Picillo Farm	Coventry	S
Rose Hill Regional Landfill	South Kingston	
Stamina Mills, Inc. (once listed as Forestdale-Stamina Mills, Inc.)	North Smithfield	
West Kingston Town Dump/URI Disposal Area	South Kingstown	
Western Sand & Gravel	Burrillville	
South Carolina:		
Beaunit Corp. (Circular Knit & Dyeing Plant)	Fountain Inn	
Carolawn, Inc.	Fort Lawn	
Elmore Waste Disposal	Greer	
Geiger (C & M Oil)	Rantoules	
Golden Strip Septic Tank Service	Simpsonville	
Helena Chemical Co. Landfill	Fairfax	
Independent Nail Co.	Beaufort	C
Kalama Specialty Chemicals	Beaufort	
Koppers Co., Inc. (Florence Plant)	Florence	
Leonard Chemical Co., Inc.	Rock Hill	
Lexington County Landfill Area	Cayce	
Medley Farm Drum Dump	Gaffney	
Palmetto Recycling, Inc.	Columbia	
Palmetto Wood Preserving	Dixiana	
Para-Chem Southern, Inc.	Simpsonville	
Rochester Property	Travelers Rest	
Rock Hill Chemical Co.	Rock Hill	
Sangamo Weston, Inc./Twelve-Mile Creek/Lake Hartwell PCB Contamination	Pickens	
SCRDI Bluff Road	Columbia	S
SCRDI Dixiana	Cayce	C
Townsend Saw Chain Co.	Pontiac	
Wamchem, Inc.	Burton	
South Dakota:		
Whitewood Creek	Whitewood	C,S
Williams Pipe Line Co. Disposal Pit	Sioux Falls	
Tennessee:		
American Creosote Works, Inc. (Jackson Plant) (once listed as American Creosote Works)	Jackson	
Amnicola Dump	Chattanooga	
Arlington Blending & Packaging	Arlington	
Carrier Air Conditioning Co.	Collierville	

TABLE 1.—GENERAL SUPERFUND SECTION, OCTOBER 1992—Continued

State and site name	City/county	Notes
Galloway Pits	Galloway	
Lewisburg Dump	Lewisburg	
Mallory Capacitor Co.	Waynesboro	
Murray-Ohio Dump	Lawrenceburg	
North Hollywood Dump	Memphis	S
Velsicol Chemical Corp. (Hardeman County)	Toone	
Wrigley Charcoal Plant	Wrigley	
Texas:		
Bailey Waste Disposal	Bridge City	
Bio-Ecology Systems, Inc.	Grand Prairie	
Brio Refining, Inc.	Friendswood	
Crystal Chemical Co.	Houston	
Crystal City Airport	Crystal City	C
Dixie Oil Processors, Inc.	Friendswood	
French, Ltd.	Crosby	
Geneva Industries/Fuhrmann Energy	Houston	
Highlands Acid Pit	Highlands	C
Koppers Co., Inc. (Texarkana Plant)	Texarkana	
Molco, Inc.	La Marque	S
North Cavalcade Street	Houston	
Odessa Chromium #1	Odessa	
Odessa Chromium #2 (Andrews Highway)	Odessa	
Pesses Chemical Co.	Fort Worth	C
Petro-Chemical Systems, Inc. (Turtle Bayou)	Liberty County	
Sheridan Disposal Services	Hempstead	
Sikes Disposal Pits	Crosby	
Sol Lynn/Industrial Transformers	Houston	
South Cavalcade Street	Houston	
Stewco, Inc.	Waskom	C
Tex-Tin Corp.	Texas City	
Texarkana Wood Preserving Co.	Texarkana	
Triangle Chemical Co.	Bridge City	C
United Creosoting Co.	Conroe	
Utah:		
Midvale Slag	Midvale	
Monticello Radioactively Contaminated Properties	Monticello	
Petrochem Recycling Corp./Ekotek, Inc.	Salt Lake City	
Portland Cement (Kiln Dust 2 & 3)	Salt Lake City	
Rose Park Sludge Pit	Salt Lake City	C,S
Sharon Steel Corp. (Midvale Tailings) (once listed as Sharon Steel Corp. (Midvale Plant))	Midvale	
Utah Power & Light/American Barrel Co.	Salt Lake City	
Wasatch Chemical Co. (Lot 6)	Salt Lake City	
Virginia:		
Abex Corp.	Portsmouth	
Arrowhead Associates/Scovill Corp.	Montross	
Atlantic Wood Industries, Inc.	Portsmouth	
Avtex Fibers, Inc.	Front Royal	
Buckingham County Landfill (once listed as Love's Container Service Landfill)	Buckingham	
C & R Battery Co., Inc.	Chesterfield County	
Chisman Creek	York County	C
Culpeper Wood Preservers, Inc.	Culpeper	
Dade Caverns County Landfill	Salem	
First Piedmont Corp. Rock Quarry (Route 719) (once listed as First Piedmont Corp. Rock Quarry)	Pittsylvania County	
Greenwood Chemical Co.	Newtown	
H & H Inc., Burn Pit	Farrington	
L.A. Clarke & Son	Spotsylvania County	
Rentokil, Inc. (Virginia Wood Preserving Division)	Richmond	
Rhinehart Tire Fire Dump	Frederick County	
Saltville Waste Disposal Ponds	Saltville	
Saunders Supply Co.	Chuckatuck	
Suffolk City Landfill	Suffolk	C
U.S. Titanium	Piney River	
Vermont:		
Bennington Municipal Sanitary Landfill	Bennington	
BFI Sanitary Landfill (Rockingham)	Rockingham	
Burgess Brothers Landfill	Woodford	
Darling Hill Dump	Lyndon	C
Old Springfield Landfill	Springfield	
Parker Sanitary Landfill	Lyndon	
Pine Street Canal	Burlington	S
Tansitor Electronics, Inc.	Bennington	
Washington:		
ALCOA (Vancouver Smelter)	Vancouver	
American Crossarm & Conduit Co.	Chehalis	
American Lake Gardens	Tacoma	
Centralia Municipal Landfill	Centralia	
Colbert Landfill	Colbert	
Commencement Bay, Near Shore/Tide Flats	Pierce County	

TABLE 1.—GENERAL SUPERFUND SECTION, OCTOBER 1992—Continued

State and site name	City/county	Notes
Commencement Bay, South Tacoma Channel	Tacoma	
FMC Corp. (Yakima Pit)	Yakima	
Frontier Hard Chrome, Inc.	Vancouver	
General Electric Co. (Spokane Shop)	Spokane	
Greenacres Landfill	Spokane County	
Harbor Island (Lead)	Seattle	
Hidden Valley Landfill (Thun Field)	Pierce County	
Kaiser Aluminum Mead Works	Mead	
Lakewood Site	Lakewood	C
Mica Landfill	Mica	
Midway Landfill	Kent	
Moses Lake Wellfield Contamination	Moses Lake	
North Market Street (once listed as Tosco Corp. (Spokane Terminal))	Spokane	
Northside Landfill	Spokane	
Northwest Transformer	Everson	
Northwest Transformer (South Harkness Street)	Everson	
Old Inland Pit	Spokane	
Pacific Car & Foundry Co.	Renton	
Pasco Sanitary Landfill	Pasco	
Pesticide Lab (Yakima)	Yakima	C
Queen City Farms	Maple Valley	
Seattle Municipal Landfill (Kent Highlands)	Kent	
Silver Mountain Mine	Loomis	C
Vancouver Water Station #4 Contamination	Vancouver	
Western Processing Co., Inc.	Kent	C
Wyckoff Co./Eagle Harbor	Bainbridge Island	
Yakima Plating Co.	Yakima	C
Wisconsin:		
Algoma Municipal Landfill	Algoma	
Better Brite Plating Co. Chrome & Zinc Shops	DePere	
City Disposal Corp. Landfill	Dunn	
Delavan Municipal Well #4	Delavan	
Eau Claire Municipal Well Field	Eau Claire	C
Fadowski Drum Disposal	Franklin	
Hagen Farm	Stoughton	
Hechimovich Sanitary Landfill	Williamstown	
Hunts Disposal Landfill	Caledonia	
Janesville Ash Beds	Janesville	
Janesville Old Landfill	Janesville	
Kohler Co. Landfill	Kohler	
Lauer I Sanitary Landfill	Menomonee Falls	
Lemberger Landfill, Inc. (once listed as Lemberger Fly Ash Landfill)	Whitelaw	
Lemberger Transport & Recycling	Franklin Township	
Madison Metropolitan Sewerage District Lagoons	Bloomington	
Master Disposal Service Landfill	Brookfield	
Mid-State Disposal, Inc. Landfill	Cleveland Township	
Moss-American (Kerr-McGee Oil Co.)	Milwaukee	
Muskego Sanitary Landfill	Muskego	
N.W. Mauthe Co., Inc.	Appleton	S
National Presto Industries, Inc.	Eau Claire	
Northern Engraving Co.	Sparta	C
Oconomowoc Electroplating Co. Inc.	Ashippin	
Omega Hills North Landfill	Germantown	
Onalaska Municipal Landfill	Onalaska	
Refuse Hideaway Landfill	Middleton	
Sauk County Landfill	Excelsior	
Schmalz Dump	Harrison	
Scrap Processing Co., Inc.	Medford	
Sheboygan Harbor & River	Sheboygan	
Spickler Landfill	Spencer	
Stoughton City Landfill	Stoughton	
Tomah Armory	Tomah	
Tomah Fairgrounds	Tomah	
Tomah Municipal Sanitary Landfill	Tomah	
Waste Management of Wisconsin, Inc. (Brookfield Sanitary Landfill)	Brookfield	
Waste Research & Reclamation Co.	Eau Claire	
Wausau Ground Water Contamination	Wausau	
Wheeler Pit	Le Prairie Township	
West Virginia:		
Fike Chemical, Inc.	Nitro	
Follansbee Site	Follansbee	
Leetown Pesticide	Leetown	C
Ordnance Works Disposal Areas	Morgantown	
West Virginia Ordnance	Point Pleasant	S
Wyoming:		
Baxter/Union Pacific Tie Treating	Laramie	
Mystery Bridge Road/U.S. Highway 20	Evansville	

Note: 1,085 Total Sites.

C=Construction Completion category.

H=Based on issuance of health advisory (if scored, HRS score need not be 28.50 or greater).

S=State top priority (if scored, HRS score need not be 28.50 or greater).

TABLE 2—FEDERAL FACILITIES SECTION, OCTOBER 1992

State and Site Name	City/County	Notes
Alaska:		
Eielson Air Force Base	Fairbanks N Star Borough	
Elmendorf Air Force Base	Greater Anchorage Borough	
Fort Wainwright	Fairbanks N Star Borough	
Standard Steel & Metals Salvage Yard (USDOT)	Anchorage	
Alabama:		
Alabama Army Ammunition Plant	Childersburg	
Anniston Army Depot (Southeast Industrial Area)	Anniston	
Arizona:		
Luke Air Force Base	Glendale	
Williams Air Force Base	Chandler	
Yuma Marine Corps Air Station	Yuma	
California:		
Barstow Marine Corps Logistics Base	Barstow	
Camp Pendleton Marine Corps Base	San Diego County	
Castle Air Force Base	Merced	
Edwards Air Force Base	Kern County	
El Toro Marine Corps Air Station	El Toro	
Fort Ord	Marina	
George Air Force Base	Victorville	
Jet Propulsion Laboratory (NASA)	Pasadena	
Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory (USDOE)	Livermore	
Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory (Site 300) (USDOE)	Livermore	
March Air Force Base	Riverside	
Mather Air Force Base (once listed as Mather Air Force Base (AC&W Disposal Site))	Sacramento	
McClellan Air Force Base (Ground Water Contamination)	Sacramento	
Moffett Naval Air Station	Sunnyvale	
Norton Air Force Base	San Bernardino	
Riverbank Army Ammunition Plant	Riverbank	
Sacramento Army Depot	Sacramento	
Sharpe Army Depot	Lathrop	
Tracy Defense Depot	Tracy	
Travis Air Force Base	Solano County	
Treasure Island Naval Station—Hunters Point Annex	San Francisco	
Colorado:		
Air Force Plant PJKS	Waterton	
Rocky Flats Plant (USDOE)	Golden	
Rocky Mountain Arsenal	Adams County	
Connecticut: New London Submarine Base	New London	
Delaware: Dover Air Force Base	Dover	
Florida:		
Cecil Field Naval Air Station	Jacksonville	
Homestead Air Force Base	Homestead	
Jacksonville Naval Air Station	Jacksonville	
Pensacola Naval Air Station	Pensacola	
Georgia:		
Marine Corps Logistics Base	Albany	
Robins Air Force Base (Landfill #4/Sludge Lagoon) (once listed as Robins Air Force Base)	Houston County	
Guam: Andersen Air Force Base	Yigo	
Hawaii:		
Pearl Harbor Naval Complex	Pearl Harbor	
Schofield Barracks	Oahu	
Iowa: Iowa Army Ammunition Plant	Middletown	
Idaho:		
Idaho National Engineering Laboratory (USDOE)	Idaho Falls	
Mountain Home Air Force Base	Mountain Home	
Illinois:		
Joliet Army Ammunition Plant (Load-Assembly-Packing Area)	Joliet	
Joliet Army Ammunition Plant (Manufacturing Area)	Joliet	
Sangamo Electric Dump/Orchard National Wildlife Refuge (USDOL)	Carterville	
Savanna Army Depot Activity	Savanna	
Kansas: Fort Riley	Junction City	
Louisiana: Louisiana Army Ammunition Plant	Doyline	
Massachusetts:		
Fort Devens	Fort Devens	
Fort Devens—Sudbury Training Annex	Middlesex County	
Otis Air National Guard Base/Camp Edwards	Falmouth	
Maryland:		
Aberdeen Proving Ground (Edgewood Area)	Edgewood	
Aberdeen Proving Ground (Michaelsville Landfill)	Aberdeen	
Maine:		
Brunswick Naval Air Station	Brunswick	
Loring Air Force Base	Limestone	
Minnesota:		
Naval Industrial Reserve Ordnance Plant	Fridley	
Twin Cities Air Force Reserve Base (Small Arms Range Landfill)	Minneapolis	

TABLE 2—FEDERAL FACILITIES SECTION, OCTOBER 1992—Continued

State and Site Name	City/County	Notes
Missouri:		
Lake City Army Ammunition Plant (Northwest Lagoon)	Independence	
Weldon Spring Quarry/Plant/Pits (USDOE/Army) (once listed as Weldon Spring Quarry (USDOE/Army))	St. Charles County	
Weldon Spring Former Army Ordnance Works	St Charles County	
North Carolina: Camp Lejeune Military Reservation (once listed as Camp Lejeune Marine Corps Base)	Onslow County	
Nebraska: Cornhusker Army Ammunition Plant	Hall County	
New Hampshire: Pease Air Force Base	Portsmouth/Newington	
New Jersey:		
Federal Aviation Administration Technical Center	Atlantic County	
Fort Dix (Landfill Site)	Pemberton Township	
Naval Air Engineering Center	Lakehurst	
Naval Weapons Station Earle (Site A)	Colts Neck	
Piscataway Arsenal	Rockaway Township	
W.R. Grace & Co., Inc./Wayne Interim Storage Site (USDOE) (once listed as W.R. Grace & Co., Inc. (Wayne Plant))	Wayne Township	
New Mexico:		
Cal West Metals (USSBA)	Lemitar	
Lee Acres Landfill (USDOE)	Farmington	
New York:		
Brookhaven National Laboratory (USDOE)	Upton	
Griffiss Air Force Base	Rome	
Plattsburgh Air Force Base	Plattsburgh	
Seneca Army Depot	Romulus	
Ohio:		
Feed Materials Production Center (USDOE)	Fernald	
Mound Plant (USDOE)	Miamisburg	
Wright-Patterson Air Force Base	Dayton	
Oklahoma: Tinker Air Force Base (Soldier Creek/Building 3001)	Oklahoma City	
Oregon: Umatilla Army Depot (Lagoons)	Hermiston	
Pennsylvania:		
Letterkenny Army Depot (Property Disposal Office Area)	Franklin County	
Letterkenny Army Depot (Southeast Area)	Chambersburg	
Naval Air Development Center (8 Waste Areas)	Warminster Township	
Tobyhanna Army Depot	Tobyhanna	
Puerto Rico: Naval Security Group Activity	Sabana Seca	
Rhode Island:		
Davisville Naval Construction Battalion Center	North Kingston	
Newport Naval Education & Training Center	Newport	
South Carolina: Savannah River Site (USDOE)	Aiken	
South Dakota: Ellsworth Air Force Base	Rapid City	
Tennessee:		
Memphis Defense Depot	Memphis	
Milan Army Ammunition Plant	Milan	
Oak Ridge Reservation (USDOE)	Oak Ridge	
Texas:		
Air Force Plant #4 (General Dynamics)	Fort Worth	
Lone Star Army Ammunition Plant	Texarkana	
Longhorn Army Ammunition Plant	Karnack	
Utah:		
Hill Air Force Base	Ogden	
Monticello Mill Tailings (USDOE)	Monticello	
Ogden Defense Depot	Ogden	
Tooele Army Depot (North Area)	Tooele	
Virginia:		
Defense General Supply Center	Chesterfield County	
Naval Surface Warfare Center—Dahlgren	Dahlgren	
Naval Weapons Station—Yorktown	Yorktown	
Washington:		
Bangor Naval Submarine Base	Silverdale	
Bangor Ordnance Disposal	Bremerton	
Bonneville Power Administration Ross Complex (USDOE)	Vancouver	
Fairchild Air Force Base (4 Waste Areas)	Spokane County	
Fort Lewis (Landfill No. 5)	Tacoma	
Fort Lewis Logistics Center	Tillicum	
Hamilton Island Landfill (USA/COE)	North Bonneville	
Hanford 100-Area (USDOE)	Benton County	
Hanford 1100-Area (USDOE)	Benton County	
Hanford 200-Area (USDOE)	Benton County	
Hanford 300-Area (USDOE)	Benton County	
McChord Air Force Base (Wash Rack/Treatment Area)	Tocoma	
Naval Air Station, Whidbey Island (Ault Field)	Whidbey Island	
Naval Air Station, Whidbey Island (Seaplane Base)	Whidbey Island	
Naval Undersea Warfare Engineering Station (4 Waste Areas)	Keyport	
Wyoming: F.E. Warren Air Force Base	Cheyenne	

Note: 123 Total Sites.

C=Completion category.

H=Based on issuance of health advisory (if scored, HRS score need not be 28.50 or greater).

S=State top priority (if scored, HRS score need not be 28.50 or greater).

[FR Doc. 92-24893 Filed 10-13-92; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-M

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 300

[FRL-4521-2]

National Priorities List for Uncontrolled Hazardous Waste Sites, Proposed Rule No. 13

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency.

ACTION: Proposed rule.

SUMMARY: The Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 ("CERCLA" or "the Act"), as amended, requires that the National Oil and Hazardous Substances Pollution Contingency Plan ("NCP") include a list of national priorities among the known releases or threatened releases of hazardous substances, pollutants, or contaminants throughout the United States. The National Priorities List ("NPL") constitutes this list.

The Environmental Protection Agency ("EPA") proposes to add new sites to the NPL. This 13th proposed revision to the NPL includes eight sites in the General Superfund Section and one in the Federal Facilities Section. In addition, one final site is proposed for expansion. The identification of a site for the NPL is intended primarily to guide EPA in determining which sites warrant further investigation to assess the nature and extent of public health and environmental risks associated with the site and to determine what CERCLA-financed remedial action(s), if any, may be appropriate. This action and a final rule published elsewhere in this Federal Register result in an NPL of 1,208 sites, 1,085 of them in the General Superfund Section and 123 in the Federal Facilities Section. An additional 28 sites are proposed, 25 in the General Superfund Section and 3 in the Federal Facilities Section. Final and proposed sites now total 1,236.

DATES: Comments on the expansion of the Austin Avenue Radiation Site in Delaware County, PA, must be submitted on or before November 13, 1992. Comments on all other sites must be submitted on or before December 14, 1992.

ADDRESSES: Mail original and three copies of comments (no facsimiles) to Docket Coordinator, Headquarters; U.S. EPA CERCLA Docket Office; OS-245; Waterside Mall; 401 M Street SW.; Washington, DC 20460; 202/260-3046. For additional Docket addresses and further details on their contents, see

Section I of the "Supplementary Information" portion of this preamble.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Martha Otto, Hazardous Site Evaluation Division, Office of Emergency and Remedial Response (OS-5204G), U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 401 M Street, SW., Washington, DC 20460, or the Superfund Hotline, Phone (800) 424-9346 or (703) 920-9810 in the Washington, DC, metropolitan area.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

- I. Introduction.
- II. Purpose and Implementation of the NPL.
- III. Contents of This Proposed Rule.
- IV. Regulatory Impact Analysis.
- V. Regulatory Flexibility Act Analysis.

I. Introduction

Background

In 1980, Congress enacted the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act, 42 U.S.C. 9601-9675 ("CERCLA" or "the Act") in response to the dangers of uncontrolled hazardous waste sites. CERCLA was amended on October 17, 1986, by the Superfund Amendments and Reauthorization Act ("SARA"), Public Law No. 99-499, stat. 1613 *et seq.* To implement CERCLA, the Environmental Protection Agency ("EPA" or "the Agency") promulgated the revised National Oil and Hazardous Substances Pollution Contingency Plan ("NCP"), 40 CFR Part 300, on July 16, 1982 (47 FR 31180), pursuant to CERCLA section 105 and Executive Order 12316 (46 FR 42237, August 20, 1981). The NCP sets forth the guidelines and procedures needed to respond under CERCLA to releases and threatened releases of hazardous substances, pollutants, or contaminants. EPA has revised the NCP on several occasions, most recently on March 8, 1990 (55 FR 8866).

Section 105(a)(8)(A) of CERCLA requires that the NCP include "criteria for determining priorities among releases or threatened releases throughout the United States for the purpose of taking remedial action." As defined in CERCLA section 101(24), remedial action tends to be long-term in nature and involves response actions that are consistent with a permanent remedy for a release.

Mechanisms for determining priorities for possible remedial actions financed by the Trust Fund established under CERCLA (commonly referred to as the "Superfund") are included in the NCP at 40 CFR 300.425(c) (55 FR 8845, March 8, 1990). Under 40 CFR 300.425(c)(1), a site may be included on the NPL if it scores sufficiently high on the Hazard Ranking System ("HRS"), which is Appendix A of 40 CFR Part 300. On December 14,

1990 (55 FR 51532), EPA promulgated revisions to the HRS partly in response to CERCLA section 105(c), added by SARA. The revised HRS evaluates four pathways: ground water, surface water, soil exposure, and air. The HRS serves as a screening device to evaluate the relative potential of uncontrolled hazardous substances to pose a threat to human health or the environment. Those sites that score 28.50 or greater on the HRS are eligible for the NPL.

Under a second mechanism for adding sites to the NPL, each State may designate a single site as its top priority, regardless of the HRS score. This mechanism, provided by the NCP at 40 CFR 300.425(c)(2), requires that, to the extent practicable, the NPL include within the 100 highest priorities, one facility designated by each state representing the greatest danger to public health, welfare, or the environment among known facilities in the State.

The third mechanism for listing, included in the NCP at 40 CFR 300.425(c)(3), allows certain sites to be listed whether or not they score above 28.50, if all of the following conditions are met:

- The Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry (ATSDR) of the U.S. Public Health Service has issued a health advisory that recommends dissociation of individuals from the release.
- EPA determines that the release poses a significant threat to public health.
- EPA anticipates that it will be more cost-effective to use its remedial authority (available only at NPL sites) than to use its removal authority to respond to the release.

Based on these criteria, and pursuant to section 105(a)(8)(B) of CERCLA, as amended by SARA, EPA promulgates a list of national priorities among the known or threatened releases of hazardous substances, pollutants, or contaminants throughout the United States. That list, which is Appendix B of 40 CFR part 300, is the National Priorities List ("NPL"). CERCLA section 105(a)(8)(B) defines the NPL as a list of "releases" and as a list of the highest priority "facilities." The discussion below may refer to the "releases or threatened releases" that are included on the NPL interchangeably as "releases," "facilities," or "sites." CERCLA section 105(a)(8)(B) also requires that the NPL be revised at least annually. A site may undergo CERCLA-financed remedial action only after it is placed on the NPL, as provided in the NCP at 40 CFR 300.425(b)(1).

EPA promulgated an original NPL of 406 sites on September 8, 1983 (48 FR 40658). The NPL has been expanded since then, most recently on September 25, 1991 (56 FR 48438).

The NPL includes two sections, one of sites evaluated and cleaned up by EPA (the "General Superfund Section"), and one of sites being addressed by other Federal agencies (the "Federal Facilities Section"). Under Executive Order 12580 and CERCLA section 120, each Federal agency is responsible for carrying out most response actions at facilities under its own jurisdiction, custody, or control, although EPA is responsible for preparing an HRS score and determining if the facility is placed on the NPL. EPA is not the lead agency at these sites, and its role at such sites is accordingly less extensive than at other sites. The Federal Facilities Section includes those facilities at which EPA is not the lead agency.

Deletions/Cleanups

EPA may delete sites from the NPL where no further response is appropriate, as explained in the NCP at 40 CFR 300.425(e) (55 FR 8845, March 8, 1990). To date, the Agency has deleted 44 sites from the General Superfund Section of the NPL, most recently 4 sites published elsewhere in this **Federal Register**.

EPA is developing the NPL completions list to better show the successful completion of Superfund response action at present or former NPL sites and enhance public understanding of the status of cleanup progress at sites. Sites are organized into three categories: construction completion, site completion, and NPL deletion. A site will move over time from completion of physical construction (construction completion) to achievement of remedial action objectives specified in the ROD (site completion) to deletion (being formally removed from the NPL). Thus, the NPL completions list provides a "snapshot" of site cleanup status that will need to be periodically updated to reflect newly categorized sites, and sites moving from one category to the next. More details on the completions list will be published shortly in the **Federal Register**.

In addition to the 44 RM 10/9/92 sites that have been deleted from the NPL, 105 sites are in the construction or site completion categories, all but one from the General Superfund Section. Thus, as of September 30, 1992, a total of 149 NPL sites have been cleaned up.

Cleanups at sites on the NPL do not reflect the total picture of Superfund accomplishments. As of August 31, 1992, EPA had conducted 2,349 removal

actions, 557 of them at NPL sites. Information on removals is available from the Superfund hotline.

Pursuant to the NCP at 40 CFR 300.425(c), this document proposes to add 9 sites to the NPL. In addition, EPA is proposing to expand one site to include additional contaminated areas. The General Superfund Section includes 1,085 sites, and the Federal Facilities Section includes 123 sites, for a total of 1,208 sites on the NPL. Final and proposed sites now total 1,236.

Public Comment Period

The documents that form the basis for EPA's evaluation and scoring of sites in this rule are contained in dockets located both at EPA Headquarters and in the appropriate Regional offices. The dockets are available for viewing, by appointment only, after the appearance of this rule. The hours of operation for the Headquarters docket are from 9:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m., Monday through Friday excluding Federal holidays. Please contact individual Regional dockets for hours.

Docket Coordinator, Headquarters, U.S. EPA CERCLA Docket Office, OS-245, Waterside Mall, 401 M Street, SW., Washington, DC 20460, 202/260-3046.

Evo Cunha, Region 1, U.S. EPA Waste Management Records Center, HES-CAN 6, J.F. Kennedy Federal Building, Boston, MA 02203-2211, 617/573-5729.

Ben Conetta, Region 2, 28 Federal Plaza, 7th Floor, Room 740, New York, NY 10278, 212/264-6896.

Diane McCreary, Region 3, U.S. EPA Library, 3rd Floor, 841 Chestnut Building, 9th & Chestnut Streets, Philadelphia, PA 19107, 215/597-7904.

Beverly Fulwood, Region 4, U.S. EPA Library, Room G-8, 345 Courtland Street, NE., Atlanta, GA 30385, 404/347-4216.

Cathy Freeman, Region 5, U.S. EPA, Records Center, Waste Management Division 7-J, Metcalfe Federal Building, 77 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, IL 60604, 312/886-8214.

Bart Canellas, Region 6, U.S. EPA, 1445 Ross Avenue, Mail Code 6H-MA, Dallas, TX 75202-2733, 214/655-6740.

Steven Wyman, Region 7, U.S. EPA Library, 726 Minnesota Avenue, Kansas City, KS 66101, 913/551-7241.

Greg Oberley, Region 8, U.S. EPA, 999 18th Street, Suite 500, Denver, CO 80202-2466, 303/294-7598.

Lisa Nelson, Region 9, U.S. EPA, 75 Hawthorne Street, San Francisco, CA 94105, 415/744-2347.

David Bennett, Region 10, U.S. EPA, 11th Floor, 1200 6th Avenue, Mail Stop HW-114, Seattle, WA 98101, 206/553-2103.

The Headquarters docket for this rule contains HRS score sheets for each proposed site; a Documentation Record for each site describing the information used to compute the score; pertinent information for any site affected by statutory requirements or EPA listing

policies; and a list of documents referenced in the Documentation Record. Each Regional docket for this rule contains all of the information in the Headquarters docket for sites in that Region, plus the actual reference documents containing the data principally relied upon and cited by EPA in calculating or evaluating the HRS scores for sites in that Region. These reference documents are available only in the Regional dockets. Interested parties may view documents, by appointment only, in the Headquarters or the appropriate Regional docket or copies may be requested from the Headquarters or appropriate Regional docket. An informal written request, rather than a formal request under the Freedom of Information Act, should be the ordinary procedure for obtaining copies of any of these documents.

EPA considers all comments received during the comment period. During the comment period, comments are placed in the Headquarters docket and are available to the public on an "as received" basis. A complete set of comments will be available for viewing in the Regional docket approximately one week after the formal comment period closes. Comments received after the comment period closes will be available in the Headquarters docket and in the Regional docket on an "as received" basis.

Comments that include complex or voluminous reports, or materials prepared for purposes other than HRS scoring, should point out the specific information that EPA should consider and how it affects individual HRS factor values. See *Northside Sanitary Landfill v. Thomas*, 849 F.2d 1516 (D.C. Cir. 1988). After considering the relevant comments received during the comment period, EPA will add sites to the NPL if they meet requirements set out in CERCLA, the NCP, and any applicable listing policies.

In past rules, EPA has attempted to respond to late comments, or when that was not practicable, to read all late comments and address those that brought to the Agency's attention a fundamental error in the scoring of a site. (See, most recently 57 FR 4824 (February 7, 1992)). Although EPA intends to pursue the same policy with sites in this rule, EPA can guarantee that it will consider only those comments postmarked by the close of the formal comment period. EPA cannot delay a final listing decision solely to accommodate consideration of late comments.

II. Purpose and Implementation of the NPL

Purpose

The legislative history of CERCLA (Report of the Committee on Environment and Public Works, Senate Report No. 96-848, 96th Cong., 2d Sess. 60 (1980)) states the primary purpose of the NPL:

The priority lists serve primarily informational purposes, identifying for the States and the public those facilities and sites or other releases which appear to warrant remedial actions. Inclusion of a facility or site on the list does not in itself reflect a judgment of the activities of its owner or operator, it does not require those persons to undertake any action, nor does it assign liability to any person. Subsequent government action in the form of remedial actions or enforcement actions will be necessary in order to do so, and these actions will be attended by all appropriate procedural safeguards.

The purpose of the NPL, therefore, is primarily to serve as an informational and management tool. The identification of a site for the NPL is intended primarily to guide EPA in determining which sites warrant further investigation to assess the nature and extent of the public health and environmental risks associated with the site and to determine what CERCLA-financed remedial action(s), if any, may be appropriate. The NPL also serves to notify the public of sites that EPA believes warrant further investigation. Finally, listing a site may, to the extent potentially responsible parties are identifiable at the time of listing, serve as notice to such parties that the Agency may initiate CERCLA-financed remedial action.

Implementation

After initial discovery of a site at which a release or threatened release may exist, EPA begins a series of increasingly complex evaluations. The first step, the Preliminary Assessment (PA), is a low-cost review of existing information to determine if the site poses a threat to public health or the environment. If the site presents a serious imminent threat, EPA may take immediate removal action. If the PA shows that the site presents a threat but not an imminent threat, EPA will generally perform a more extensive study called the Site Inspection (SI). The SI involves collecting additional information to better understand the extent of the problem at the site, screen out sites that will not qualify for the NPL, and obtain data necessary to calculate an HRS score for sites which warrant placement on the NPL and further study. EPA may reform removal actions at any time during the process.

To date EPA has completed approximately 33,000 PAs and approximately 16,000 SIs.

The NCP at 40 CFR 300.425(b)(1) (55 FR 8845, March 8, 1990) limits expenditure of the Trust Fund for remedial actions to sites on the NPL. However, EPA may take enforcement actions under CERCLA or other applicable statutes against responsible parties regardless of whether the site is on the NPL, although, as a practical matter, the focus of EPA's CERCLA enforcement actions has been and will continue to be on NPL sites. Similarly, in the case of CERCLA removal actions, EPA has the authority to act at any site, whether listed or not, that meets the criteria of the NCP at 40 CFR 300.415(b)(2) (55 FR 8842, March 8, 1990). EPA's policy is to pursue cleanup of NPL sites using all the appropriate response and/or enforcement actions available to the Agency, including authorities other than CERCLA. The Agency will decide on a site-by-site basis whether to take enforcement or other action under CERCLA or other authorities prior to undertaking response action, proceed directly with Trust Fund-financed response actions and seek to recover response costs after cleanup, or do both. To the extent feasible, once sites are on the NPL, EPA will determine high-priority candidates for CERCLA-financed response action and/or enforcement action through both State and Federal initiatives. EPA will take into account which approach is more likely to accomplish cleanup of the site most expeditiously while using CERCLA's limited resources as efficiently as possible.

Although the ranking of sites by HRS scores is considered, it does not, by itself, determine the sequence in which EPA funds remedial response actions, since the information collected to develop HRS scores is not sufficient to determine either the extent of contamination or the appropriate response for a particular site (40 CFR 300.425(a)(2), 55 FR 8845, March 8, 1990). Additionally, resource constraints may preclude EPA from evaluating all HRS pathways; only those presenting significant risk or sufficient to make a site eligible for the NPL may be evaluated. Moreover, the sites with the highest scores do not necessarily come to the Agency's attention first, so that addressing sites strictly on the basis of ranking would in some cases require stopping work at sites where it was already underway.

More detailed studies of a site are undertaken in the Remedial Investigation/Feasibility Study (RI/FS) that typically follows listing. The

purpose of the RI/FS is to assess site conditions and evaluate alternatives to the extent necessary to select a remedy (40 CFR 300.430(a)(2) (55 FR 8846, March 8, 1990)). It takes into account the amount of contaminants released into the environment, the risk to affected populations and environment, the cost to remediate contamination at the site, and the response actions that have been taken by potentially responsible parties or others. Decisions on the type and extent of response action to be taken at these sites are made in accordance with 40 CFR 300.415 (55 FR 8842, March 8, 1990) and 40 CFR 300.430 (55 FR 8846, March 8, 1990). After conducting these additional studies, EPA may conclude that initiating a CERCLA remedial action using the Trust Fund at some sites on the NPL is not appropriate because of more pressing needs at other sites, or because a private party cleanup is already underway pursuant to an enforcement action. Given the limited resources available in the Trust Fund, the Agency must carefully balance the relative needs for response at the numerous sites it has studied. It is also possible that EPA will conclude after further analysis that the site does not warrant remedial action.

RI/FS at Proposed Sites

An RI/FS may be performed at sites proposed in the *Federal Register* for placement on the NPL (or even sites that have not been proposed for placement on the NPL) pursuant to the Agency's removal authority under CERCLA, as outlined in the NCP at 40 CFR 300.415. Although an RI/FS generally is conducted at a site after it has been placed on the NPL, in a number of circumstances the Agency elects to conduct an RI/FS at a site proposed for placement on the NPL in preparation for a possible Trust Fund-financed remedial action, such as when the Agency believes that a delay may create unnecessary risks to public health or the environment. In addition, the Agency may conduct an RI/FS to assist in determining whether to conduct a removal or enforcement action at a site.

Facility (Site) Boundaries

The purpose of the NPL is merely to identify releases or threatened releases of hazardous substances that are priorities for further evaluation. The Agency believes that it would be neither feasible nor consistent with this limited purpose for the NPL to attempt to describe releases in precise geographical terms. The term "facility" is broadly defined in CERCLA to include any area where a hazardous substances

has "come to be located" (CERCLA section 101(9)), and the listing process is not intended to define or reflect boundaries of such facilities or releases. Site names are provided for general identification purposes only. Knowledge of the geographic extent of sites will be refined as more information is developed during the RI/FS and even during implementation of the remedy.

Because the NPL does not assign liability or define the geographic extent of a release, a listing need not be amended if further research into the contamination at a site reveals new information as to its extent. This is further explained in preambles to past NPL rules, most recently February 11, 1991 (56 FR 5598).

III. Contents of This Proposed Rule

Table 1 identifies the 8 NPL sites in the General Superfund Section and Table 2 identifies the 1 NPL site in the Federal Facilities Section being proposed in this rule. Both tables follow this preamble. All these sites are proposed based on HRS scores of 28.50 or above. The sites in Table 1 are listed alphabetically by State, for ease of identification, with group number identified to provide an indication of relative ranking. To determine group number, sites on the NPL are placed in groups of 50; for example, a site in Group 4 of this proposal has a score that falls within the range of scores covered by the fourth group of 50 sites on the General Superfund Section of the NPL. Sites in the Federal Facilities Section are also presented by group number based on groups of 50 sites in the General Superfund Section. For further information, see the discussion on format of the NPL in the final rule published elsewhere in this Federal Register.

Statutory Requirements

CERCLA section 105(a)(8)(B) directs EPA to list priority sites "among" the known releases or threatened releases of hazardous substances, pollutants, or contaminants, and section 105(a)(8)(A) directs EPA to consider certain enumerated and "other appropriate" factors in doing so. Thus, as a matter of policy, EPA has the discretion not to use CERCLA to respond to certain types of releases. Where other authorities exist, placing sites on the NPL for possible remedial action under CERCLA may not be appropriate. Therefore, EPA has chosen not to place certain types of sites on the NPL even though CERCLA does not exclude such action. If, however, the Agency later determines that sites not listed as a matter of policy are not being

properly responded to, the Agency may place them on the NPL.

The listing policies and statutory requirements of relevance to this proposed rule cover sites subject to the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) (42 U.S.C. 6901-6991i) and Federal facility sites. These policies and requirements are explained below and have been explained in greater detail in previous rulemakings (56 FR 5598, February 11, 1991).

Releases From Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) Sites

EPA's policy is that sites in the General Superfund Section subject to RCRA Subtitle C corrective action authorities will not, in general, be placed on the NPL. However, EPA will list certain categories of RCRA sites subject to Subtitle C corrective action authorities, as well as other sites subject to those authorities, if the Agency concludes that doing so best furthers the aims of the NPL/RCRA policy and the CERCLA program. EPA has explained these policies in detail in the past (51 FR 21054, June 10, 1986; 53 FR 23978, June 24, 1988; 54 FR 41000, October 4, 1989; 56 FR 5602, February 11, 1991).

Consistent with EPA's NPL/RCRA policy, EPA is proposing to add two sites to the General Superfund Section of the NPL that may be subject to RCRA Subtitle C corrective action authorities. One is the Spectron, Inc. site in Elkton, MD. Material has been placed in the public docket for the site confirming that the owner is bankrupt.

The second is the Rinchem, Co., Inc. site in Albuquerque, NM. Material has been placed in the document indicating it will be difficult to address this facility under RCRA corrective action authorities.

Releases from Federal Facility Sites

On March 13, 1989 (54 FR 10520), the Agency announced a policy for placing Federal facility sites on the NPL if they meet the eligibility criteria (e.g., an HRS score of 28.50 or greater), even if the Federal facility also is subject to the corrective action authorities of RCRA Subtitle C. In that way, those sites could be cleaned up under CERCLA, if appropriate.

This rule proposes to add one site to the Federal Facilities Section of the NPL.

Expansion of the Austin Avenue Radiation Site

The Austin Avenue Radiation site, Delaware County Pennsylvania, was proposed to the NPL on February 7, 1992 (57 FR 4824). At that time, specific areas were identified and enumerated as part of the site. EPA has identified additional

contaminated areas not included in the original proposal. EPA is proposing at this time to include these additional contaminated areas and is listing these areas in the public docket for this rule. EPA will consider comments only on these additional areas, not on the areas previously identified, for which the comment period has ended.

IV. Regulatory Impact Analysis

The costs of cleanup actions that may be taken at sites are not directly attributable to placement on the NPL, as explained below. Therefore, the Agency has determined that this rulemaking is not a "major" regulation under Executive Order 12291. EPA has conducted a preliminary analysis of the economic implications of today's proposal to add new sites to the NPL. EPA believes that the kinds of economic effects associated with this proposed revision to the NPL are generally similar to those identified in the regulatory impact analysis (RIA) prepared in 1982 for revisions to the NCP pursuant to section 105 of CERCLA (47 FR 31180, July 16, 1982) and the economic analysis prepared when amendments to the NCP were proposed (50 FR 5882, February 12, 1985). This rule was submitted to the Office of Management and Budget for review as required by Executive Order 12291.

Costs

This proposed rulemaking is not a "major" regulation because it does not establish that EPA necessarily will undertake remedial action, nor does it require any action by a private party or determine any party's liability for site response costs. Costs that arise out of responses at sites in the General Superfund Section result from site-by-site decisions about what actions to take, not directly from the act of listing itself. Nonetheless, it is useful to consider the costs that may be associated with responding to all sites in this rule. The proposed listing of a site on the NPL may be followed by a search for potentially responsible parties and a Remedial Investigation/Feasibility Study (RI/FS) to determine if remedial actions will be undertaken at a site. Selection of a remedial alternative, and design and construction of that alternative, follow completion of the RI/FS, and operation and maintenance (O&M) activities may continue after construction has been completed.

EPA initially bears costs associated with responsible party searches. Responsible parties may enter into consent orders or agreements to conduct or pay the costs of the RI/FS, remedial

design and remedial action, and O&M, or EPA and the States may share costs up front and subsequently bring an action for cost recovery.

The State's share of site cleanup costs for Trust Fund-financed actions is governed by CERCLA section 104(c). For privately-owned sites, as well as publicly-owned but not publicly-operated sites, EPA will pay from the Trust Fund for 100% of the costs of the RI/FS and remedial planning, and 90% of the costs of the remedial action, leaving 10% to the State. For sites operated by a State or political subdivision, the State's share is at least 50% of all response costs at the site, including the cost associated with the RI/FS, remedial design, and construction and implementation of the remedial action selected. After construction of the remedy is complete, costs fall into two categories.

- For restoration of ground water and surface water, EPA will pay from the Trust Fund a share of the start-up costs according to the cost-allocation criteria in the previous paragraph for 10 years or until a sufficient level of protectiveness is achieved before the end of 10 years. 40 CFR 300.435(f)(3). After that, the State assumes all O&M costs. 40 CFR 300.435(f)(1).

- For other cleanups, EPA will pay from the Trust Fund a share of the costs of a remedy according to the cost-allocation criteria in the previous paragraph until it is operational and functional, which generally occurs after one year. 40 CFR 300.435(f)(2), 300.510(c)(2). After that, the State assumes all O&M costs. 40 CFR 300.510(c)(1).

In previous NPL rulemakings, the Agency estimated the costs associated with these activities (RI/FS, remedial design, remedial action, and O&M) on an average-per-site and total cost basis. EPA will continue with this approach, using the most recent (1988) cost estimates available; these estimates are presented below. However, costs for individual sites vary widely, depending on the amount, type, and extent of contamination. Additionally, EPA is unable to predict what portions of the total costs responsible parties will bear, since the distribution of costs depends on the extent of voluntary and negotiated response and the success of any cost-recovery actions.

Cost category	Average total cost per site ¹
RI/FS.....	1,300,000
Remedial Design.....	1,500,000
Remedial Action.....	\$ 25,000,000

Cost category	Average total cost per site ¹
Net present value of O&M ²	\$ 3,770,000

¹ 1988 U.S. Dollars.

² Includes State cost-share.

³ Assumes cost of O&M over 30 years, \$400,000 for the first year and 10% discount rate.

Source: Office of Program Management, Office of Emergency and Remedial Response, U.S. EPA, Washington, DC.

Possible costs to States associated with today's proposed rule for Trust Fund-financed response action arise from the required State cost-share of: (1) for privately owned sites at which remedial action involving treatment to restore ground and surface water quality are undertaken, 10% of the cost of constructing the remedy, and 10% of the cost of operating the remedy for a period up to 10 years after the remedy becomes operational and functional; (2) for privately-owned sites at which other remedial actions are undertaken, 10% of the cost of all remedial action, and 10% of costs incurred within one year after remedial action is complete to ensure that the remedy is operational and functional; and (3) for sites publicly-operated by a State or political subdivision at which response actions are undertaken, at least 50% of the cost of all response actions. States must assume the cost for O&M after EPA's participation ends. Using the assumptions developed in the 1982 RIA for the NCP, EPA has assumed that 90% of the non-Federal sites proposed for the NPL in this rule will be privately-owned and 10% will be State- or locally-operated. Therefore, using the budget projections presented above, the cost to States of undertaking Federal remedial planning and actions at all non-Federal sites in today's proposed rule, but excluding O&M costs, would be approximately \$28 million. State O&M costs cannot be accurately determined because EPA, as noted above, will share costs for up to 10 years for restoration of ground water and surface water, and it is not known how many sites will require this treatment and for how long. However, based on past experience, EPA believes a reasonable estimate is that it will share start-up costs for up to 10 years at 25% of sites. Using this estimate, State O&M costs would be approximately \$25 million. As with the EPA share of costs, portions of the State share will be borne by responsible parties.

Placing a hazardous waste site on the NPL does not itself cause firms responsible for the site to bear costs. Nonetheless, a listing may induce firms to clean up the sites voluntarily, or it

may act as a potential trigger for subsequent enforcement or cost-recovery actions. Such actions may impose cost on firms, but the decisions to take such actions are discretionary and made on a case-by-case basis. Consequently, these effects cannot be precisely estimated. EPA does not believe that every site will be cleaned up by a responsible party. EPA cannot project at this time which firms or industry sectors will bear specific portions of the response costs, but the Agency considers: The volume and nature of the waste at the sites; the strength of the evidence linking the wastes at the site to the parties; the parties' ability to pay; and other factors when deciding whether and how to proceed against the parties.

Economy-wide effects of this proposed amendment to the NCP are aggregations of effects on firms and State and local governments. Although effects could be felt by some individual firms and States, the total impact of this proposal on output, prices, and employment is expected to be negligible at the national level, as was the case in the 1982 RIA.

Benefits

The real benefits associated with today's proposal to place additional sites on the NPL are increased health and environmental protection as a result of increased public awareness of potential hazards. In addition to the potential for more Federally-financed remedial actions, expansion of the NPL could accelerate privately-financed, voluntary cleanup efforts. Proposing sites as national priority targets also may give States increased support for funding responses at particular sites.

As a result of the additional CERCLA remedies, there will be lower human exposure to high-risk chemicals, and higher-quality surface water, ground water, soil, and air. These benefits are expected to be significant, although difficult to estimate before the RI/FS is completed at these sites.

V. Regulatory Flexibility Act Analysis

The Regulatory Flexibility Act of 1980 requires EPA to review the impacts of this action on small entities, or certify that the action will not have a significant impact on a substantial number of small entities. By small entities, the Act refers to small businesses, small government jurisdictions, and nonprofit organizations.

While this rule proposes to revise the NCP, it is not a typical regulatory change since it does not automatically

impose costs. As stated above, proposing sites to the NPL does not in itself require any action by any party, nor does it determine the liability of any party for the costs of cleanup at the site. Further, no identifiable groups are affected as a whole. As a consequence, impacts on any group are hard to predict. A site's proposed inclusion on the NPL could increase the likelihood of adverse impacts on responsible parties (in the form of cleanup costs), but at this time EPA cannot identify the potentially affected businesses or estimate the number of small businesses that might also be affected.

The Agency does expect that placing the sites in this proposed rule on the NPL could significantly affect certain

industries, or firms within industries, that have caused a proportionately high percentage of waste site problems. However, EPA does not expect the listing of these sites to have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small businesses.

In any case, economic impacts would occur only through enforcement and cost-recovery actions, which EPA takes at its discretion on a site-by-site basis. EPA considers many factors when determining enforcement actions, including not only the firm's contribution to the problem, but also its ability to pay.

The impacts (from cost recovery) on small governments and nonprofit

organizations would be determined on a similar case-by-case basis.

For the foregoing reasons, I hereby certify that this proposed rule would not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities. Therefore, this proposed regulation does not require a regulatory flexibility analysis.

List of Subjects in 40 CFR Part 300

Air pollution control, Chemicals, Hazardous materials, Intergovernmental relations, Natural resources, Oil pollution, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements, Superfund, Waste treatment and disposal, Water pollution control, Water supply.

NATIONAL PRIORITIES LIST PROPOSED RULE #13 GENERAL SUPERFUND SECTION

State	Site name	City/county	NPL Gr ¹
IA	Waterloo Coal Gasification Plant	Waterloo	5
MD	Spectron, Inc.	Elkton	4
MN	Lake Elmo Airport/Ground Water Contamination	Baytown Township	13
NE	American Shizuki Corp./Ogallala Electronics and Manufacturing, Inc.	Ogallala	5
NE	Bruno Co-op Association/Associated Properties	Bruno	5
NM	AT&SF (Albuquerque)	Albuquerque	5
NM	Rinchem Co. Inc.	Albuquerque	10
WA	Spokane Junkyard/Associated Properties	Spokane	5

¹ Sites are placed in groups (Gr) corresponding to groups of 50 on the final NPL.

Number of sites proposed for listing: 8.

NATIONAL PRIORITIES LIST PROPOSED RULE #13 FEDERAL FACILITIES SECTION

State	Site name	City/county	NPL Gr ¹
AK	Naval Air Station Adak	Adak Island	4

¹ Sites are placed in groups (Gr) corresponding to groups of 50 on the final NPL.

Number of sites proposed for listing: 1.

Authority: 42 U.S.C. 9605; 42 U.S.C. 9620; 33 U.S.C. 1321(c)(2); E.O. 11735, 3 CFR, 1971-1975 Comp., p. 793; E.O. 12580, 3 CFR, 1987 Comp., p. 193.

Dated: October 5, 1992.

Don R. Clay,

Assistant Administrator, Office of Solid Waste and Emergency Response.

[FR Doc. 92-24894 Filed 10-13-92; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 5560-50-M